W286.22
N499.4
v.9

A WORLD LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND RELIGIONS

NINTH CONGRESS OF THE

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

AT LONGWOOD, PA.

May 31 and June 1, 1919

Proceedings and Papers

I. Program and Reports. CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D.

II. Articles and Reports in Religious Journals concerning the Congress.

III. Testimonies of the Congress on Current Issues in the Religious, Ethical and Social Life of To-day.

IV. Representative Addresses at the Congress.

1. The Nature and Possibilities of Interdenominational Fellowship, by *Pres. F. C. Southworth, D.D.*, and *Rev. F. A. Bisbee, D.D.*

2. A World League of Free Nations, by *Reb. Frederick Lynch, D.D.*, and *Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D.*

BX
6
N4
A5
1919
GTU
Storage

A WORLD LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND RELIGIONS

NINTH CONGRESS OF THE

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

AT LONGWOOD, PA.

May 31 and June 1, 1919

Proceedings and Papers

I. Program and Reports. CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D.

II. Articles and Reports in Religious Journals concerning the Congress.

III. Testimonies of the Congress on Current Issues in the Religious, Ethical and Social Life of To-day.

IV. Representative Addresses at the Congress.

1. The Nature and Possibilities of Interdenominational Fellowship, by *Pres. F. C. Southworth, D.D.*, and *Rev. F. A. Bisbee, D.D.*
2. A World League of Free Nations, by *Reb. Frederick Lynch, D.D.*, and *Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D.*

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1963

Ninth Congress

OF THE

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

AT

LONGWOOD MEETING-HOUSE, KENNETT, CHESTER COUNTY, PA.

By Invitation of the Society of Progressive Friends

ON

Saturday, May 31, and Sunday, June 1, 1919

Purpose.—To promote the religious life by united testimony for sincerity, freedom, and progress in religion, by social service, and a fellowship of the spirit beyond the lines of sect and creed.

In this venerated edifice for more than half a century free and progressive men and women have met for the promotion of high causes of social and religious import. It is associated with the presence and word of Theodore Parker, William Lloyd Garrison, C. D. B. Mills, Oliver Johnson, Lucretia Mott, R. A. Dugdale, Charles G. Ames, John W. Chadwick, Henry Wilbur, Frederick A. Hinckley, and many other scholars and reformers. These traditions imparted a congenial historic and ethical setting to our convention. The intelligent community, augmented by accessions from Philadelphia and other near-by cities and towns, provided a sympathetic audience.

I have no regard to persons or professions; for, when we come into the truth, it will banish from the earth all sectarianism; and when we come back into the state which we ought to be in, to become the children of God, we shall all be brethren and sisters of one family.—*Elias Hicks.*

O brother-man! fold to thy heart thy brother;
Where pity dwells the peace of God is there;
To worship rightly is to love each other,
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.

—*John G. Whittier.*

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

was organized at Philadelphia, December 2, 1908, at a private conference of representative liberal religious thinkers and social workers of the United States. Its purpose is to unify and concentrate the forces which make for religious sincerity, freedom, tolerance, and progress in America, and bring them into council and co-operation concerning the spiritual and ethical interests they possess in common. In a sense this Federation may be considered as the offspring of the International Congress of Religious Liberals, with which it is affiliated, and whose liberalizing and reconciling influences it is intended to conserve and further in the American community. This International Congress has held six sessions in Europe and the United States, with a membership of 2000, representing officially and unofficially 30 nationalities, and over 100 different religious fellowships.

The National Federation holds, from time to time, extended public meetings of religious liberals in centres of American thought and life, at which united testimony is given in behalf of the great universal affirmations of the moral and religious life. It seeks to increase the faith of free and reasoning men in the underlying principles of pure religion held in the spirit of perfect liberty; to foster the sentiments of tolerance and good-will, both religious and racial, in the community; and to promote a fellowship of the spirit based on religious character and conduct, and not on creed and rite.

Furthermore, the Federation labors for social reform and good citizenship. It strives for the awakening of the public conscience, the promotion of social justice, and a better performance of social service and obligation. The approved institutions of human society—the family, the school, the church, and the state—in their ideal aspects receive its homage and support. The Federation co-operates with every agency which endeavors to uplift the national character and to invigorate it with ethical and social aims.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

Organized at Philadelphia in 1908, it has held eight congresses in Philadelphia, New York City, Rochester, N.Y., Oakland, Cal., Pittsburgh, Pa., and Boston.

Membership, open to all, $1.00

Professor JESSE H. HOLMES, Ph.D., *President*, Swarthmore College, Pa.
CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D., *Secretary-Treasurer*, 165 Hunnewell Avenue, Newton, Mass. (to whom communications may be addressed).

Honorary Vice-Presidents

ELIZABETH POWELL BOND, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa.
SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D.D., President American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.
DANIEL EVANS, D.D., Professor Andover Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.
FREDERICK R. GRIFFIN, Minister First Unitarian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
MORRIS JASTROW, Ph.D., Professor University of Pennsylvania (Ethical Culture Society).
LEE S. MCCOLLESTER, D.D., Dean Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass., President Universalist General Convention.
HENRY MOTTET, D.D., Rector Church of the Holy Communion, New York City.
LUCIA AMES MEAD, National Secretary Woman's Peace Party, Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM ROSENAU, D.D., Rabbi, Baltimore, Md.
JOSEPH SWAIN, LL.D., Friend, President Swarthmore College, Pa.
AMBROSE WHITE VERNON, D.D., Brookline, Mass.

Council

Professor JESSE H. HOLMES, Ph.D., Swarthmore, Pa.
CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D., Newton, Mass.
Dr. O. EDWARD JANNEY, Baltimore, Md.
HENRY BERKOWITZ, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. J. HERMAN RANDALL, New York.
Professor ANNA GARLIN SPENCER, New York.
S. BURNS WESTON, Philadelphia, Pa.
J. CLARENCE LEE, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
CARL A. VOSS, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.
FRANK O. HALL, D.D., New York.
Rev. HENRY R. ROSE, D.D., Newark, N.J.
Rev. MINOT O. SIMONS, Cleveland, Ohio.
J. BARNARD WALTON, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Dr. LOUIS GROSSMAN, Cincinnati, Ohio.

FRANK H. BURT, Boston, Official Reporter of the National Federation of Religious Liberals.

THE HIGH COURT OF NATIONS

Tune, "Lyons"

Hear, hear, O ye Nations, and hearing obey
The cry from the past and the call of to-day!
Earth wearies and wastes with her fresh life outpoured,
The glut of the cannon, the spoil of the sword.

Lo, dawns the new era, transcending the old,
The poet's rapt vision, by prophet foretold!
From war's grim tradition it maketh appeal
To service of all in a world's commonweal.

Home, altar, and school, the mill and the mart,
The workers afield, in science, in art,
Peace-circled and sheltered, shall join to create
The manifold life of the firm-builded State.

Then, then shall the empire of right over wrong
Be shield to the weak and a curb to the strong;
Then justice prevail and, the battle-flags furled,
The High Court of Nations give law to the world.

And thou, O my Country, from many made one,
Last-born of the nations, at morning thy sun,
Arise to the place thou art given to fill,
And lead the world-triumph of peace and good-will!

—Frederick L. Hosmer.

A PRAYER

Give me, O Lord, eyes to behold the truth;
A seeing sense that knows the eternal right;
A heart with pity filled and gentlest ruth;
A manly faith that makes all darkness light;

Give me the power to labor for mankind;
Make me the mouth of such as cannot speak;
Eyes let me be to groping men, and blind;
A conscience to the base, and to the foolish, mind.

Father, I will not ask for wealth or fame,
If I may give my strength unto the weak.
I shudder not to bear a hated name,
If I may help those who thy kingdom seek.

—Theodore Parker.

PROGRAM

FIRST SESSION

Saturday Morning, May 31

Each session will be preceded by a brief devotional service.

10 o'clock. *Topic:* THE SUPREME LOYALTIES.

Loyalty to something greater than self is the inspiration of morality and the essence of religion.

1. TO ONE'S OWN CONSCIENCE.

Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?—*Jesus.*

Conscience, the voice of God in the soul of man.—*Theodore Parker.*

This above all: To thine own self be true.
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

—*Shakespeare.*

There will never be a free and enlightened state until the state comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.—*Thoreau.*

Address, Prof. Paul M. Pearson, Ph.D.,* Swarthmore College.

2. TO IDEALS.

THE IDEAL IS THE REAL

Fear not to build thine eyrie in the heights
Where golden splendors lay,
And trust thyself unto thyself
In simple truth alway;
And God will make divinely real
The highest forms of thine ideal.

If you cannot realize your ideal, then idealize your real.

Address, Prof. Leslie Pinckney Hill, Principal Cheyney School for Teachers.

*Professor Pearson and Dr. Frederick Lynch exchanged places on the program in order to permit each of these speakers to keep other engagements.

3. To Family and Home.

A single thought divine
  Holds stars and suns in space;
A dream of man is Thine,
  And history finds its place.
When the universe was young,
  Thine was the Perfect Thought,
That life should be bound in one
  By the strand of Love enwrought.

In the life of the fern and the lily,
  Of the dragon and the dove,
Still through the stress and struggle
  Waxes the bond of love.
Out from the ruthless ages
  Rises, like incense mild,
The love of the man and the woman,
  The love of the mother and child.

—*David Starr Jordan.*

In the marriage union the independence of the husband and wife will be equal, their dependence mutual, and their obligations reciprocal.—*Lucretia Mott.*

The family is the heart's fatherland; the fatherland is the cradle of humanity.—*Mazzini.*

Address, Prof. Anna Garlin Spencer, New York City, *First Vice-Chairman of the American Section of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace.*

4. To the Nation.

O Beautiful! my Country! ours once more!
Smoothing thy gold of war-dishevelled hair
O'er such sweet brows as never other wore,
  And letting thy set lips,
  Freed from wrath's pale eclipse,
The rosy edges of their smile lay bare,
What words divine of lover or of poet
Could tell our love and make thee know it,
Among the Nations bright beyond compare?
What were our lives without thee?
What all our lives to save thee?
We reck not what we gave thee;
We will not dare to doubt thee,
But ask whatever else, and we will dare!

—*James Russell Lowell.*

Address, Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D.D., President American Unitarian Association, Boston.

5. To the Brotherhood of Man.

Limitless as is our debt to our own country, we owe far more to the great Fatherhood, Mankind. All men are brothers. —*Fénelon.*

Above all nations is Humanity.—*Goethe.*

We want men of original perception and original action, who can open their eyes wider than to a nationality; namely, to consideration of benefit to the human race, and can act in the interests of civilization.—*R. W. Emerson.*

Be as they who will not falter—
Many swords or few—
Till we make this earth the altar
Of a worship new;
We be they who will not take
From palace, priest, or code,
A meaner law than "Brotherhood"—
A lower Lord than God.

—*Edwin Arnold.*

Address, Prof. Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., Swarthmore College.

---

12 o'clock. Intermission. Luncheon on the grounds.

SECOND SESSION

Saturday Afternoon, May 31

2 o'clock. *Topic:* The National Tasks that Await Us.

Much yet remains undone.
Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war.

—*John Milton.*

A great work awaits us now that the war is over, and it should be prepared for; a new order of society, a new international ethic, a new interpretation of religion, a reconstructed church, and a more inclusive religious fellowship.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

1. The Replacement of the War-Spirit with Peaceful Activities and the Ideals of Social Service and Universal Brotherhood.

America for the World

Tune, "Materna"

O Land of lands, my Fatherland, the beautiful, the free,
All lands and shores to freedom dear are ever dear to thee:
All sons of Freedom hail thy name, and wait thy word of might,
While round the world the lists are joined for liberty and light.

Hail sons of France, old comrades dear! Hail Britons brave and true!
Hail Belgian martyrs ringed with flame! Slavs fired with visions new!
Italian lovers mailed with light! Dark brothers from Japan!
From East to West all lands are kin who live for God and man.

Here endeth war! Our bands are sworn! Now dawns the better hour
When lust of blood shall cease to rule, when Peace shall come with power;
We front the fiend that rends our race and fills our homes with gloom!
We break his sceptre, spurn his crown, and nail him in his tomb!

Now, hands all round, our troth we plight to rid the world of lies,
To fill all hearts with truth and trust and willing sacrifice;
To free all lands from hate and spite and fear from strand to strand;
To make all nations neighbors and the world one Fatherland!

—*Washington Gladden.*

Address, Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., Editor *Christian Work*, New York City.

2. The Social-Economic Reorganization of the Nation.

A Prayer for Workingmen

We pray for our brothers, the industrial workers of the Nation. As their work binds them together in common toil and danger may their hearts be knit together in a strong sense of their common interests and destiny. May they realize that the injury of one is the common concern of all, and that the welfare of all must be the aim of every one. Teach them to keep step in a steady onward march, and bear the common burdens.

Grant the organizations of labor quiet patience, and pru-

dence in all disputes, and fairness to see the other side. Save them from malice and bitterness. Save them from the headlong folly which ruins a fair cause, and give them wisdom resolutely to put aside the two-edged sword of violence that turns on those who seize it. Raise up for them still more leaders of able mind and large heart, and give them grace to follow the wiser counsel.

Grant all classes of our Nation a larger comprehension for the aspirations of labor and for the courage and worth of these our brothers, that we may cheer them in their struggles and understand them even in their sins. And may the upward climb of Labor, its defeats and its victories, in the farther reaches bless all classes of our Nation, and build up for the Republic of the future a great body of workers, strong of limb, clear of mind, fair in temper, glad to labor, conscious of their worth, and striving together for the final brotherhood of man.

A Prayer for Employers

We invoke grace and wisdom upon all men of good-will who employ and control the labor of men. Amid the numberless irritations and anxieties of their position, may they be helped to keep a quiet and patient temper, and to rule firmly and wisely, without harshness and anger. Since they hold power over the bread, the safety, and the hopes of the workers, may they wield their powers justly and with love, as older brothers and leaders in the great fellowship of labor. Suffer not the heavenly light of compassion for the weak and the old to be quenched in their hearts. May they not follow the ruthless ways which sacrifice human health and life for profit. Save them from repressing their workers into sullen submission and helpless fear.

Raise up among us employers who shall be makers of men as well as of goods, masters of industry who will use their ability and knowledge in lifting their fellow-workers to increasing independence and vigor, men of faith and good-will who see beyond the strife of the present, and catch a vision of a nobler organization of work; when all toilers, whether with hand or brain, will work together in co-operative industry for mutual ends and with reciprocal obligations; still following the leadership of the ablest, not in fear but by the glad will of all; when none shall be master and none shall be man, but all stand side by side in a strong and righteous brotherhood of toil and service.

—*Walter Rauschenbusch.*

From "Prayers of the Social Awakening" (Slightly Altered).

Society has passed from status to contract, and may seem to hold that contract is the last word, the true expression of freedom. We have passed from status to contract, we must pass on from contract to organization, and thus to true freedom.—*Felix Adler.*

Addresses: Raymond H. Bye, on "Social Forces of a New World," and Emerson P. Harris, Montclair, N.J., on "The Co-operative Movement."

3. The Religious Rebirth of the Nation.

To love justice, to long for the right, to love mercy, to assist the weak, to forget wrongs and remember benefits, to love the truth, to be sincere, to utter honest words, to love liberty, to wage relentless war against slavery in all its forms, to love wife and children and friends, to make a happy home, to love the beautiful in nature and in art, to cultivate the mind, to be familiar with the mighty thoughts that genius has expressed, the noble deeds of all the world, to cultivate courage and cheerfulness, to fill life with the splendor of generous acts, the warmth of loving words, to discard error, to destroy prejudice, to receive new truths with gladness, to cultivate hope, to see the calm beyond the storm, the dawn beyond the night, to do the best that can be done, and then be resigned with the conviction that whatever is is best, and is in its causes just—this is a religion to live by and to die by; this is the religion I think I see coming.—*A British Clergyman.*

The mighty nineteenth century movement of feeling, thought, and life has come tiding into human consciousness, bringing the new Science, the new Industrialism, the new Democracy, the new Emancipation of Women, the new Social Conscience, the new Internationalism. This new conception of the universe, this new conception of mankind, in relation to that Unity of Life, Law, Love that we name "God" is for the coming religion to interpret in terms of the spirit. To reveal the Imminent God in nature, history, society, souls—that is the task magnificent on which the faith of the twentieth century is entering.—*William C. Gannett.*

Address, Rev. John Clarence Lee, D.D., Minister Church of the Restoration, Philadelphia.

4. The Fulfilment of International Obligations. A World-League of Nations.

> To pledge our souls to nobler, higher life,
> To win the world to his fair sanctities,
> To bind the nations in a Pact of Peace
> And free the Soul of Life for finer loyalties
>
> —*John Oxenham.*

I am convinced myself that there is no more evil thing in this present world than Race Prejudice, none at all. I write deliberately—it is the worst single thing in life now. It justifies and holds together more baseness, cruelty and abomination than any other sort of error in the world.—*H. G. Wells*

> Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
> In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world
>
> —*Alfred Tennyson*

Address, Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Sunday Morning, June 1

10 o'clock. *Topic:* The Nature and Possibilities of Interdenominational Fellowship.

Endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.—*Ephesians iv. 3.*

A huge, universal, ecclesiastical organization, existing in all lands, an *imperium in imperio*, is about the last thing any patriotic man in any enlightened country would wish to see. Let there be unity in action against the forces of evil, with the utmost freedom for individual opinion in matters of theology and organization. If one set of Christian men desires to worship God with an ornate ritual, and still another in silence, why should they not be allowed to do so? If one group prefers an ecclesiastical organization headed by a Pope; a second, one headed by bishops; a third, one headed by ministers; and a fourth wants one without any ordained clergy, why thwart them? In our Father's house are many mansions. If all the faithful hold their—not the, but their—faith in the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life, then will the Christian Church as a whole go forth conquering and to conquer. Jesus Christ taught a religion of conduct, not of opinion. Christian men should follow him. When our boys come back from the front, after facing realities, they will have little stomach for disputes. The motto of our Christian men should be, "Diversity in opinion, unity in action."—*John Brooks Leavitt, D.D.*

Not fusion but federation is the practical religious need of the hour.

The only religious unity possible is one that recognizes diversities in opinion and worship in order that it may act on the common ethical results of all the beliefs.—*Anon.*

Addresses, Rev. Franklin C. Southworth, D.D., President Meadville (Pa.) Theological School, and Rev. Frederick A. Bisbee, D.D., editor *Universalist Leader.*

11.30 o'clock. A commemoration of Frederick A. Hinckley, for twenty-nine years Chairman of the Society of Progressive Friends, Longwood.

Addresses: Anna Garlin Spencer, Elizabeth Powell Bond, and others.

12.30 o'clock. Luncheon on the grounds.

Sunday Afternoon, June 1

2 o'clock. *Topic:* THE SYMPATHY OF WORLD RELIGIONS.

Religions are many. Religion is one. O God, whichever road I take joins the great highway that leads to Thee.—*Hindu.*

With all nations with whom there is religion are like precepts, and all who live them from religion are saved. All religion is of life; and a life of religion is doing good.—*Emanuel Swedenborg.*

"That all the peoples walk, each one in the name of its God, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever."—*Micah iv. 5.*

Every religion is good, every religion is true—to him who in his due caution and conscience believes it. There is but one bad religion,—that of a man who professes a faith which he does not believe; but the good religion may be, and often is, corrupted by the wretched and wicked prejudices which admit a difference of opinion as a cause of hatred.—*Daniel O'Connell, Roman Catholic.*

The larger and true Catholicity is not confined within the lines of any single church, however venerable or extended, whether it be Catholic or Protestant in historic descent. It embraces in its sympathy all types of religion and all modes of worship, non-Christian as well as Christian. It extends its good-will to unbelievers, its charity to sinners, and includes in its loving thought and prayer every creature God hath made and which shares in his bounty. This is the universal religion of humanity, the true and catholic church on earth.—*C. W. Wendte.*

A Day is coming, when even what we call the great religions of the world shall show themselves but sects, and when all these little sects shall be united in one vast assemblage.—*T. W. Higginson.*

Addresses:

1. Is a Universal Religion Possible? Charles W. Wendte, D.D., General Secretary International and National Congresses of Religious Liberals.

2. A World-League of Religions. Henry Berkowitz, D.D., Rabbi Temple Rodeph Shalom, Philadelphia.

3. The Shanghai Conferences of World-Religions. Gilbert Reid, D.D., Director International Institute of China.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

In the year 1917 two full congresses of the National Federation were held, in Pittsburgh (in March) and in Boston (in September). The proceedings and papers of these meetings were printed and sent to the members, to a carefully selected list of representative religious and social workers in the United States and other countries, and to eighty public and college libraries.

Mindful of the close relationship of our Federation with the International Council of Religious Liberals, we bore the expense, in March, 1919, of printing and mailing to three hundred and fifty selected addresses in Europe and other countries, including our own, a letter to the President of the United States and the Peace Congress at Paris, appealing for action on their part to assure freedom of worship for religious minorities in Transylvania, Roumania, Poland, and other countries in Eastern Europe—for orthodox and Unitarian Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews. We are happy to believe, because of responses received from the private secretary of President Wilson, from ex-President William H. Taft, and from influential liberals in European countries, that our appeal has not been in vain, and that in the treaties to be made by the Allies and the League of Nations with newly formed or reconstituted states, religious liberty for all races and beliefs will be fully safeguarded.

It had been intended to hold another congress in the spring of 1918, but the serious and protracted illness of the organizing secretary of the Federation, to whom the selection of a place, the preparation of a program, and the securing of speakers have been too exclusively committed of late, made this impossible. The secretary was able to issue the two reports of Congresses in 1917, maintained a large correspondence, sent out a letter last spring to the membership, and participated in public meetings within easy reach, in behalf of interdenominational unity, of which one at Hyannis, Mass., was of particular interest. He also addressed the Central Congress of American Rabbis in Boston, in May last.

On his recovery, in the spring of 1919, he again

undertook the work of organizing a meeting of the Federation, which was successfully held at Longwood, Chester County, Pa., in May–June, and of which the present volume is a partial report. The papers presented will largely appear in the columns of the *Universalist Leader,* published at 349 Boylston Street, Boston. It is hoped to issue Dr. Franklin C. Southworth's address on "The True Basis of Interdenominational Fellowship" as a separate pamphlet, to be sent to our membership.

Meanwhile it has become apparent to the secretary that, with increasing years and diminishing strength, he must surrender many of the tasks in which he has until now been able to render congenial service. He has therefore asked the Directors of the Federation to relieve him of his secretarial duties at as early a day as possible. The passing away, one after another, of honored and helpful fellow-workers in this cause, who, eleven years ago, united with him in organizing the National Federation of Religious Liberals,—Henry Wilbur, Charles E. St. John, George H. Ferris, and J. Leonard Levy among them,—has placed upon the secretary greater responsibilities than he can justly bear. The matter is now under sympathetic consideration, and will doubtless be arranged in accordance with his wishes and the best interests of the society. The latter has gone on successfully despite these disadvantages, and has never occupied so high a place as now in the esteem of its membership and of the religious bodies composing it. It is hoped to hold during the coming year a notable congress to be devoted to the lessons taught the religious community by the occurrence in 1920 of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, Mass. In the meantime the members of the Federation are earnestly reminded of their duty to support the endeavors of their Board of Government by a faithful espousal of the principles and aims of the society in their own communities, by promptly meeting their annual dues, and in other ways seconding and heartening the unselfish labors of those whom they have chosen as their leaders in what we believe to be the only possible and enduring basis of interdenominational and inter-religious unity—the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace. C. W. W.

FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

JANUARY 18, 1918, TO APRIL 25, 1919

RECEIPTS

1918.		
Jan. 18.	Balance forwarded	$208.90
Feb. 20.	Annual Contribution, for 1918, Universalist General Convention	100.00
1919.		
Feb. 28.	Annual Contribution, for 1919, by General Conference Religious Society of Friends..	100.00
Apr. 25.	Annual Contribution, for 1919, by American Unitarian Association	100.00
	Annual Memberships and Gifts	245.00
		$753.90

EXPENDITURES

1918.		
May 1.	Expenses, Secretary-Treasurer (Typing, Stationery, Postage, etc.)	$27.02
June 18.	Advertising, *Universalist Leader*	14.00
Oct. 21.	Geo. H. Ellis Co. (Printing & Mailing Report Boston Congress)	243.67
	Geo. H. Ellis Co. (Reprints)	14.00
	Geo. H. Ellis Co. (Membership Certificate Books)	13.50
1919.		
Jan. 1.	Expenses, Secretary-Treasurer (Typing, Stationery, Postage, etc.)	15.50
Feb. 18.	Geo. H. Ellis Co. (Printing and Mailing Circular to Members)	24.75
Mar. 5.	Expenses, Secretary-Treasurer (Typing, Stationery, Postage, etc.)	12.55
" 6.	Printing Circular "Religious Liberty in Transylvania"	18.50
Apr. 25.	Longwood Congress (Typing, Postage, Telegraphing, etc.)	3.46
	To Balance	366.95
		$753.90

Audited vouchers
and found correct.

F. A. BISBEE.
F. H. BURT.

Note.—The treasurer regrets to say that, owing in part no doubt to the omission of the usual annual congress in 1918, there has been a falling off during the past year in annual membership dues and gifts. It is apparent that to preserve our membership and income is essential to the life of the Federation. While the treasurer's statement shows a balance on hand, which will be increased still further by the payment of contributions made by the Universalist body, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis for the year 1918–1919, all this income will be required to meet the expenses of the recent congress at Longwood, Pa., and to print its proceedings. We must look to our members for adequate support in the year before us. C. W. W.

NINTH SESSION
OF THE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS
AT LONGWOOD, PA.

(From *The Christian Register.*)

A large representation of delegates and friends, excellent speaking, and harmonious proceedings throughout marked the recent session of the Federation of Religious Liberals in the old meeting-house of the Progressive Friends at Longwood, Chester County, Pa., which in bygone days echoed with the eloquence of Theodore Parker, Lucretia Mott, William Lloyd Garrison, and Charles G. Ames, those stalwart advocates of religious and social reform. The surroundings were beautiful, green lawns, noble trees, and a quaint cemetery, where, among others, the ashes of Bayard Taylor repose.

The opening religious service was conducted by Dr. F. A. Bisbee, editor of the *Universalist Leader*, who took an active part in the work of the meetings. The genial president, Prof. Jesse H. Holmes of Swarthmore, introduced as the first speaker, Dr. Frederick Lynch, editor of *Christian Work*, just returned from the Peace Conference at Paris.

Dr. Lynch made a powerful and impressive plea for the League of Nations Covenant, admitting its imperfections and his own disappointment with it, but urging its adoption by the United States Senate as the only way to save the nations of Europe from anarchy and the world from continuous wars. This point of view was later indorsed in an able address by Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania, and other speakers. The following testimony, offered by Prof. Anna Garlin Spencer, was unanimously adopted as the sense of the meeting:—

Resolved, That those present at this Ninth Congress of the Federation of

Religious Liberals pledge support to the League of Nations Covenant; not because it is that perfect instrument of international justice and world organization for permanent peace for which we have hoped and worked, but because its preamble and many of its provisions lead toward, and we believe make possible of future attainment, the substitution of law for war, and the co-operation of all the nations of the world in securing human welfare.

Later in the session, Rabbi Berkowitz of Philadelphia made an impassioned plea for a League of Religions to assure freedom of worship and co-operative social endeavor throughout the world. He presented a series of resolutions which were adopted by a unanimous rising vote:—

WHEREAS, the National Federation of Religious Liberals is meeting at a time when our beloved country is rejoicing in the close of the World War and in the triumph of the principle of democracy; and

WHEREAS, the complete emancipation of oppressed peoples has been the inspiring watchword of those who fought to make the world free; and

WHEREAS, despite this solemn promise, in whose behalf so many lives have been offered and so much sorrow endured, the position of oppressed people in the world still remains a question of public controversy while Armenians, Transylvanians, and other Christians, Koreans, Jews in Eastern lands, and others, continue to be deprived of the fundamental human rights, and to be denied civic, political, and religious equality; and

WHEREAS, appalling oppression, persecution, and slaughter of helpless peoples have persisted during and since the war,—therefore

Be it resolved, That the National Federation of Religious Liberals assembled at Longwood Meeting-house, Kennett, Pa., June 1, 1919, records its profound sympathy with the oppressed and suffering of all faiths; that we pledge our readiness to extend to them every help in our power; that we

herewith issue a solemn protest against the wrongs inflicted upon them, and demand that the Powers of the World put an end to these horrors, which serve to mock and defeat the righteous aims proclaimed by the war.

We record our profound sense of regret that the Covenant of the League of Nations, which is part of the Treaty of Peace, has failed to include a Religious Liberty clause.

The National Federation of Religious Liberals herewith voices the urgent hope of all lovers of freedom that provisions shall be made in the treaties by which new states are to be created, or existing states enlarged, for complete religious liberty.

The National Federation of Religious Liberals further makes the earnest appeal that the Covenant of the League of Nations be amended by the addition of a clause to the following effect: "The high contractive parties to this covenant agree to religious liberty within their several states, to the end that their respective citizens or subjects will in no way be deprived of civil, political, or economic rights on account of their religious beliefs or creeds."

Resolved, That the National Federation of Religious Liberals, through its president, appoint a commission to urge this amendment before the first meeting of the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations in October, 1919.

The secretary read a telegram sent to the Longwood Congress by Rev. Dr. K. Kohler, president of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, and honorary president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis: "Greetings of Friendship and Fellowship! Not uniformity of religious beliefs, but an ever-growing sympathetic and mutual understanding is our common aim."—*K. Kohler.*

A series of addresses followed on the general topic, "The Supreme Loyalties." Prof. Paul M. Pearson of Swarthmore spoke on the supremacy of the individual conscience. Principal Leslie P. Hill, the head of the Cheyney School for Teachers, a

recent graduate of Harvard, and one of the most promising young men of color in America, spoke in fervent advocacy of his race, whom he declared to be idealists, and believers in truth, justice, and humanity, despite their sad experiences.

A resolution offered by President Jesse H. Holmes was unanimously adopted as the voice of the meeting on this topic:—

> The Federation of Religious Liberals puts itself upon record as condemning without qualification that meanest and most dangerous of emotions—race prejudice. So long as it holds place in our national life we cannot attain to real democracy; and we pledge ourselves to lifelong endeavor for its extinction, and to the firm establishment in America of the equal rights of men and women without regard to race, color, or any other accident of birth.

Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer in an address of exceptional power upheld the ideals of the family life. Dr. S. A. Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, spoke with force and fervor on loyalty to country and nationality. Rev. C. W. Wendte offered a series of testimonies which were later adopted, and which in substance read:—

> Recognizing that with the ending of the Great War human society is to enter a new era in which universal justice and good-will are to be more fully embodied in the laws, institutions, and customs of the nations of the earth, we plead that peaceful and constructive activities, and the ideals of social service and universal brotherhood, should take the place of the spirit and pursuits of war.
>
> The central purpose of the Peace Conference now in session in Paris should be the *abolition of war*, now and forever. We ask for a speedy disarmament, not only by enemy nations, but by all the countries engaged in the war, especially our own, and that our national army and navy be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety and international

obligations. We protest against the spirit and aims of militarism, inflaming the public mind with visions of military supremacy at home and abroad. While honoring the loyalty, courage, and devotion displayed by our American soldiers, we deplore the tendency in many of the churches of the land to glorify and crown with the aureole of sainthood all displays of military prowess, and to hold up the soldier as the highest type of citizenship. We demand that with the ending of the war the practice of conscription be abolished. We protest against the attempt to introduce into our peace-loving nation the institution of compulsory military training for American youth.

In its place we ask for a voluntary enlistment of all the young people of the United States in a patriotic dedication of a portion of their time and labor to public-welfare work for the common good, with vocational training included, and public recognition and acclaim for exceptional merit. In a word, we would create a *working* army, and not a *standing* army.

We ask for the immediate release of all political prisoners who shall not have been proven guilty of overt crimes against the community. All necessity for their further detention having vanished, we urge their prompt dismissal as an act of justice and humanity.

We rejoice in the steady growth and approaching triumph of the principle of equal suffrage in our public life, believing that it will confer on womanhood an added dignity and opportunity, and greatly increase the forces of purity, justice, and love in American society.

Believing that alcoholism is a dire disease, destructive to health, undermining personal and domestic happiness, wasting the material resources of the community and debauching its political life, we commend the recent prohibitive legislation of the several American States and of the Federal Congress, and trust that these will not fail to make further provision for its enforcement.

We indorse the nation-wide move-

ment for the reform of the prison systems of the Federal Government and the States composing it. Not the punishment, but the reform of the prisoner, and his restitution to physical and moral health, honest self-support, and civil rights should be the central aim of his incarceration.

Recognizing that we ought to admit foreign immigrants to this country only as fast as we can assimilate them to American standards of living, and prevent their exploitation by unscrupulous greed, we assert that there should be no discrimination against European or Asiatic immigrants on the grounds of race, color, or similar distinctions.

The theme for the afternoon's discussion was: "National Tasks that Await Us." Mr. Raymond H. Bye spoke on "Social Forces of a New World," and Mr. Emerson P. Harris of Montclair, apostle of the Co-operative Movement, on the manifest advantages of this great economic reform.

The opinion of the Federation on these issues was voiced in a series of testimonies which were taken over from a similar social declaration made by the Unitarian General Conference at its Washington meeting in 1911:—

Testimony of Social-Economic Issues

We Stand

1. For equal rights and complete justice for all men of all races in all stations of life.
2. For the principles of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions and the full consideration of the rights of the public at times of disagreement or industrial warfare.
3. For the protection of the workers from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, and mining disasters.
4. For the abolition of child labor and the protection of children from exploitation in industry.
5. For such regulation of the conditions of toil and hours of labor for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.
6. For the gradual and reasonable

reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

7. For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

8. For a more equitable division of the products of industry.

9. For suitable provision for the old age of workers and for those incapacitated by injury in industry.

10. For the control of the natural resources of the earth in the interests of all the people.

11. For the gaining of wealth according to the highest ethical standards and the holding of wealth as a social trust.

12. For the discouragement of the immoderate desire for wealth, and the exaltation of man as the end and standard of industrial activity.

13. For the abolition of poverty, and provision against non-employment.

14. For proper housing, and wholesome recreation for the people.

15. For such safeguarding and extension of the institutions of democratic government as will permit and insure the maintenance of the rights of all against encroachment from the special interests of the few.

Rev. John Clarence Lee, D.D., pastor of the Universalist church in Philadelphia, treated of the rebirth of religion demanded by the present hour, a thoughtful and weighty word. Sunday morning was devoted to "The Nature and Possibilities of Interdenominational Fellowship." Dr. F. C. Southworth, president of the Meadville Theological School, was the first speaker, and his paper was one of the great utterances of the Congress. It will be printed in full and should have a wide circulation. Dr. F. A. Bisbee followed with a sane and genial talk in the same vein, and offered the following reaffirmation of the attitude of the Congress in this matter:—

> The main purpose of this Congress is to affirm and promote in the public,

and especially the religious, mind its central conviction that true and enduring religious fellowship cannot be brought about by uniformity either of belief or worship. It can only be attained by oneness of moral sympathy and purpose; by mutual respect for differences of opinion and custom combined with that Unity of the Spirit which makes possible inter-religious fellowship and co-operation for human and social service beyond the lines of sect and creed. Not by the amalgamation of existing doctrines and forms, nor by the general acceptance of an "irreducible minimum" of belief; not by an attempt to create a single and universal Church; only by the voluntary federation of the religious forces of the community for promoting, amidst large varieties of thought and church connection, the moral and spiritual ideals they hold in common, can real and effective religious fellowship be established. For while "intellectual sympathies are limited, moral sympathies are universal."

On motion of Mr. Frank H. Burt, of Boston, this testimony was adopted by a unanimous vote.

After a brief interval an hour was devoted to a commemoration of the twenty-nine years of service rendered by the late Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley to the Society of Progressive Friends at Longwood as its chairman. Rev. C. W. Wendte conducted a religious service. Anna Garlin Spencer presided, and offered a tribute to Mr. Hinckley, as did Elizabeth Powell Bond, late Dean of Swarthmore College, Mrs. C. A. Hannam, and other friends. It was an impressive occasion.

The closing session in the afternoon considered the topic of "The Sympathy of World-Religions," and was addressed by Rev. C. W. Wendte, Rabbi Berkowitz, and finally by Dr. Gilbert Reid, who gave an interesting account of the conferences of religion held by teachers of a dozen different world-faiths in his National Institute of China in Shanghai.

Nothing has been said in this condensed report of the Congress of the friendly

intercourse, the lunches served under a great tent, the delightful singing of Mrs. William Hagans of Kennett, and other social features of the meetings, which contributed much to the picturesqueness and charm of the gathering at Longwood. It is one more testimony to the value of this association of religious liberals, which fills a need and meets an opportunity in the life of the denominations affiliated with it, and whose value to the religious community becomes daily more apparent.

C. W. W.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

(From the *Universalist Leader.*)

This is an organization that runs true to name. It is a federation. There is not the slightest effort made on the part of any one to absorb any other. There is no intricate organization which, by and by, under the direction of some ambitious spirit, can be transformed into another denomination and thus defeat the purpose for which the federation was founded. Its objects are instruction, inspiration, and fellowship of the spirit. The members come together once or twice a year in connection with a great program of master minds, and each brings his own wide-open mind and the hand of fraternity. Here is unity of religious forces without merging.

This latest session, the ninth, was unique. The hosts were the Liberal Friends, and the place of meeting, the Longwood Meeting-house in Kennett, Chester County, Pa. The meeting-house is isolated, far from any houses, but the company came from miles about, and filled the church for two days of the regular session, and for a special meeting arranged by the Quakers themselves on the day preceding.

The building is interesting—very plain, as is characteristic of the Friends meeting-houses, but adapted and furnished for modern religious service. We were greatly surprised to find a good organ. Two galleries appear, a large one at the rear and a small one directly over the pulpit. I could not learn what was the special purpose of the latter, but speculated over its possibilities in case the preacher strung it out too long!

The Longwood meeting will be remembered as one in which the promise of the program was realized. Every speaker announced was present with one exception, and a substitute was sent in his place, and every speaker took his appointment very seriously and prepared for something

worth while and produced something worthy. We have secured a considerable number of the addresses and shall publish them as fast as we conveniently can.

The president of the Federation, Prof. Jesse H. Holmes of Swarthmore College, presided, and after devotional exercises according to the beautiful custom of the Friends, introduced as the first speaker the Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., editor of the *Christian Work*, who spoke on the League of Nations, which "we must have, or have anarchy."

Five other addresses, on the general theme of "The Supreme Loyalties," were given during the forenoon, testing the staying power of the audience and also testing the good judgment of the speakers, none of whom ran overtime. We heard the Rev. John Clarence Lee, D.D., of Philadelphia, Prof. Leslie Pinckney Hill of the Cheyney School for Teachers, Prof. Paul M. Pearson of Swarthmore, Prof. Anna Garlin Spencer, Raymond H. Bye, and Emerson P. Harris.

After a delightful luncheon beneath a tent on the lawn, the afternoon session was enriched by messages from Prof. Morris Jastrow of Pennsylvania University, and Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, on "National and International Relations."

No evening services were held, all the guests from a distance being taken in carriages or autos to their place of entertainment, most of us being housed at the Unicorn Inn in Kennett.

Sunday was a great day; the weather, though warm, was not depressing. The two addresses of the morning on "Interdenominational Fellowship" were given by the Rev. Franklin C. Southworth, D.D., president of Meadville Theological School, and by the Rev. Frederick A. Bisbee, D.D., editor of the *Universalist Leader*.

Following these came a memorial service for the Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley, for twenty-nine years chairman of the Society of Progressive Friends at Longwood. Addresses were made by Prof. Anna Garlin Spencer, Elizabeth Powell

Bond, formerly dean of Swarthmore, and others, with some exquisite vocal music with zither accompaniment by Mrs. William Hagans.

Four addresses in the afternoon, on "The Sympathy of World Religions," concluded the meetings. These were given by Dr. Charles W. Wendte, Prof. Jesse H. Holmes, Rabbi Henry Berkowitz, and Dr. Gilbert Reid, director of the International Institute of China.

We appeal to all of our people everywhere to get into the membership of this one, and almost the only, sane experiment in religious unity, that they may have the opportunity of attending the sessions, and receiving all the printed matter. F. A. B.

COMING NEAR TO A WORKABLE UNITY

(Editorial, *Universalist Leader.*)

The ninth session of the National Federation of Religious Liberals was held in a place of unique historic interest. The Longwood Meeting-house is located in Chester County, Pennsylvania, about two miles and a half from everywhere, the only near neighbors being the magnificent DuPont estate and the interesting old cemetery in which repose the remains of Bayard Taylor, and many others not so widely known. This venerated edifice, built by the Friends for their Yearly Meeting more than half a century ago, has been devoted to the free and progressive messages by many of the leaders of humanity. The invitation of the Liberal Friends to the Federation to hold this session in this unique meeting-house was gladly accepted, and a great company came in carriages and autos, so that for two days the place was filled, and a glorious program was carried through. The thing that impresses us as significant is the practical illustration of a real religious unity. Here we had Jew and Gentile,

Friend and Presbyterian, Universalist and Unitarian, and many others, coming together in a Federation which instead of destroying the integrity of any organization, correlated all these different forces into an efficient and gratifying unity. We hear so much to-day of proposed "unions" which mean nothing but absorption of the weak by the strong without making the strong stronger! We do well to consider this National Federation as the same way of bringing the forces of religion into a working unity which will work for the good of the world, without destroying the workers.

THE LIBERAL CONGRESS

(Editorial, *The Jewish Exponent*, Philadelphia.)

The National Federation of Religious Liberals, which held its ninth congress at the Friends meeting-house at Kennett last week, conducted its proceedings on the high plane which this excellent organization has established.

Not all the members of religious denominations that are considered liberal are truly liberal in their attitude towards people of other faiths than their own. Sometimes they are as full of prejudice as any of the members of the strictly orthodox churches, some of whom, in fact, are less given to racial and social prejudices of one kind or another. Nevertheless, as a rule, the liberal religions have in the ranks of their advocates a great majority of men and women who are as free from prejudice and religious bigotry as it is given to any mortal to be, and it is the spirit and the viewpoint of these good people that the National Federation worthily represents. There are a number of Jewish members, of whom Dr. Henry Berkowitz is one of the leaders.

The Congress that met last week adopted a ringing resolution in which its members put themselves on record as "condemning without qualification that meanest and most dangerous of emotions

—race prejudice. So long as it holds a place in our national life we cannot attain to real democracy, and we pledge ourselves to lifelong endeavor for its extinction, and the firm establishment in America of the equal rights of man and woman without regard to race, color, or any other accident of birth."

There can be no question as to the truth and the justice of this declaration. We are very far indeed from having attained the high plane of civic rectitude which this resolution demands. But that we must attain it to establish peace among the people of our own land cannot be gainsaid. And the same declaration applies to religious prejudice. You cannot respect and treat justly the man whom you despise because you do not like his religion and he does not profess yours. The process of despising inevitably leads to hatred and strife, to discrimination and oppression, and to the injustice which knows neither reason, sympathy, nor mercy.

International peace depends much more largely on intra-national peace than we are wont to surmise. A congeries of nations in which the inhabitants of each land are constantly engaged in bitter contention will sooner or later flare up into a breach of the peace between two or more of them. There can be no permanent peace until, by the process of education conducted by men of liberal thought and progressive ideals, the various peoples are led to banish bigotry, prejudice, intolerance, and race hatred.

CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH

PARK AVENUE AND THIRTY-FOURTH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

JUNE 18, 1919.

Dear Dr. Wendte,—On my return to my office I find on my desk a letter from Mrs. Spencer. It tells in detail of what happened at the Longwood Conference. May I congratulate you on a splendid achievement, and wish you all success for the future? You must be very proud of this organization, and glad for the strengthening of your hands which it has granted you. I hope that the Federation and the F. R. A. may always enjoy close co-operation and help one another wherever and whenever possible.

Believe me, as always,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES,
President of the Free Religious Association of America.

DR. CHARLES W. WENDTE.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REMARKS BY MR. FRANK H. BURT
OF NEWTON, MASS.

I ask the privilege of saying a few words before reading the resolution which I wish to offer at this time. We have spent two most delightful days in this place, the historic surroundings of which have deeply impressed us. It has been a great privilege to meet in this house, so closely associated from its earliest years with the struggle against slavery that it may truly be counted a shrine of liberty. If I may be permitted a personal allusion, we have all been impressed with the beautiful tributes paid to the memory of Mr. Hinckley, but to me they have had special significance. For my earliest church recollections are of the Free Con-

gregational Society of Florence, Mass., which later was ministered to with devotion, not only by Mr. Hinckley, but also by two of the friends who have spoken so tenderly in his memory to-day, Mrs. Bond and Mrs. Spencer, and all three were warm friends of my grandfather, one of the founders of that society. And so the occasion has been full of most impressive associations to me and I have felt it a great privilege to be present.

Just before leaving home I read a poem of Whittier ("The Golden Wedding of Longwood"), written many years ago as a tribute to his friends, Mr. and Mrs. Cox, whose home was almost in sight of this place. And so I came here with a keen anticipation of the beauty of Longwood and its surroundings from the description which the poet gives in the lines which he addresses to his much-loved friends:—

"Again before me, with your names,
fair Chester's landscape comes,
Its meadows, woods, and ample barns,
and quaint stone-builded homes.
The smooth-shorn vales, the wheaten
slopes, the boscage green and soft,
Of which their poet sings so well from
towered Cedarcroft."

From other lines of the poem I learned of the sufferings and almost martyrdom endured in the cause of freedom by those who built this house; and to-day I have been told that near by may still be seen a relic of those days, the barn which served as the "underground railway station,"—

"The poor slave's house of refuge, when
the hounds were on his track,
And saint and sinner, church and state,
joined hands to send him back."

In another verse Mr. Whittier pays a personal tribute to some of the departed members of the community,—

"The eagle face of Lindley Coates,
brave Garrett's daring zeal,
The Christian grace of Pennock, the
steadfast heart of Neal."

Those of us who have met Miss Josephine Pennock and realize all she has done as one of the Committee of Arrangements in providing for our comfort and enjoyment, will be glad to know that one of her name and kindred received this tribute at the hands of the poet.

And now as we leave this beautiful spot I am sure there are those among us who have known Longwood and its people long enough to say with the writer of the poem,—

> "Fair fall on Kennett's pleasant vales
> and Longwood's bowery ways
> The mellow sunset of your lives, friends
> of my early days."

I move the adoption of the following resolution:—

> *Resolved*, That we tender our hearty thanks to the Longwood Conference of Progressive Friends for their invitation to hold this Congress in this historic place, and to the members of the Committee of Arrangements for their hospitality and their untiring efforts for our comfort and enjoyment during our meetings in this shrine of liberty.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Dr. C. W. Wendte). One is reminded of Shakespeare's words:—

> How far that little candle throws its
> beams!
> So shines a good deed in a naughty
> world.

How far Longwood's light goes out,—to Florence, to Wilmington, to Philadelphia, to Boston, to the Pacific coast,—everywhere you find representatives of the Longwood meeting and the Independent Society of Friends. All in favor of that resolution of thanks and acknowledgment will please say aye. [Unanimous response.]

THE NATURE AND POSSIBILITIES OF INTERDENOMINATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT F. C. SOUTHWORTH, D.D., MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Is it possible for the different denominations of Christendom, with differing traditions, varying forms of worship and divergent creeds, to enjoy fellowship one with another, and if so what shall be the nature of that fellowship? At a time when so many venerable institutions, religious as well as civil, are falling in pieces, and the whole future of organized religion is said to be trembling in the balance, the question is a pertinent one. The answer will be found in an examination of the religious societies or churches of which denominations are composed.

The modern church is the product of a twofold development. Two distinct ideas about its origin and nature have come down from the earliest times. It is usually thought of as having originated with Christianity, but it is really very much older than Christianity. Before Christianity was born the Israelites had been the people of the Church. As the synagogue was the mother of the Church, so was the tabernacle the mother of the synagogue. And the tabernacle was, according to the belief of the Israelite, the place where the finite and the Infinite met together. For in the tabernacle there was the holy place, and within the holy place there was the most holy place, or the holy of holies; and in the holy of holies it was possible for the devout Hebrew, in the person of his high priest, to come into the very presence of his God. This possibility of communing with God, through the mediation of the priest, is what made the church for the Hebrew a divine institution. According to the belief of the Hebrew, and later, indeed, according to the belief of the Christian, there came to the people from the priest a divine effluence. As the Christian form of

[illegible] became more elaborate. The divine authority was administered through the sacraments, either by baptism or the eucharist. Without the sacraments and the priest, there could be no divine grace, and therefore no Christianity and no church.

This evangelism of the church gave rise to a hierarchy. It brought into the world Lord Presbyters and Lord Bishops, Church Parties, Church Policies, Persecution and Prelacy, and placed them in a position of high authority. According to this theory all these were necessary for the existence of the church. The management of the church was vested in the clergy. It was the function of the laity to provide the funds with which the work of the church was carried on and to receive the priestly sacraments, the priestly forgiveness and the priestly benedictions. If by any means the sacraments had been interrupted, or by virtue of some accident the clergy had been removed from the face of the earth, the church would have come to an abrupt end. It would then have become forever impossible to possess another church, except by means of some new dispensation, which would have started another succession, and would have created a new channel of divine grace. Even a revelation would have availed, however the direct intervention of a supernatural power.

Altogether of this conception, there has existed, here from the earliest times, an effort exceedingly subtle [illegible] and equally intelligent. I like to picture to myself the scene which for me marks the beginning of the Christian church. A young and strange man walking by the shore of an inland sea. And as he walked he saw, by a few over the place, two other men, as fishers and [illegible] as himself, fishing. He called out to them, "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men." And there was something in the countenance of the man that called, as in the days of its first institute, as in their present knowledge of him that baptized them, [illegible] to leave their nets and follow

him. To that peaceful scene I like to turn as the beginning of the first Christian church. How tremendously simple was the process of its formation! The question that was to prove so absorbing later as to whether baptism was to be administered by sprinkling or immersion, was not even remotely suggested. There was no mention at all of original sin, or foreordination, or apostolic succession, or the historic episcopate. There was simply a prophet soul, all on fire with the belief that God was speaking directly to him and burning to incarnate his message in human life, confronted by two brother men who he thought might be made with himself bearers of the good tidings of the blessed God. That was all, and that was enough to inaugurate the greatest religious movement the world has ever seen; a soul filled with the consciousness of God, of God as a present factor in human life, and one or two other souls who were willing to stand by his side in his effort to make the thought of God a vital thing. These are the two factors, and the only two indispensable factors, in any true church. And these two factors are sufficient to create a social tie of unexampled strength and permanence.

But such associations of men antedate Christianity by many centuries. The scene which signalized the beginning of Christianity has marked the beginning of similar companies of men the world over. Even in those distant ages, when the hand of every man was against his neighbor, there have been memorable occasions when there dawned upon some soul the vision of a more perfect order, in which love should take the place of hate, and greed should yield to generosity, and all men, everywhere, should do justly and love mercy and walk humbly before their God. And when there stood by the side of such a person another who shared the same glorious vision, and the two pledged fealty to each other, and embarked together upon a quest for a purer and a higher social order, and sought through

union with others to realize their aims, then there has come into being, in whatever land it was born, and under whatever banner it has sailed, a church of the living God.

How radically different, however, is the conception which underlies such an assemblage of men as this from the other conception of the church of which I spoke. The distinction must be clearly seen in order to understand the difficulties in the way of certain efforts in the direction of church union which are being made at the present time. According to the former theory it required a supernatural dispensation to start the church upon its way. According to the understanding of Jesus and the Apostles the church is simply a company of fallible human beings, who have united in the interest of the Kingdom of God. According to the former conception it is the function of the church to establish rites and forms and creeds which shall be authoritative and perpetual. According to the latter the rites of the church simply represent the wishes of the people of the church at any particular time. According to the former theory it is the function of the church to rule; according to the latter its chief business is to serve. Any vital and effective interdenominational fellowship between the two types of churches which have been the outgrowth of these theories demands that one of them should give way to the other, or, in other words, that one should be recognized as fundamentally true, and the other as fundamentally false.

What Is Its Use?

The age in which we live is essentially practical, utilitarian. To each custom, however well established, to every institution, however venerable, it is applying the test, "What is it worth? How does it serve the time in which it exists? What does it offer to the world in return for what it asks?" Institutions of religion, like all other human institutions, are

called upon to answer this question. They appeal to busy men for a portion of their time, for money, for loyalty to their ideals. They, too, must face the question, "What have you to give in return for what you ask?" And by their ability to answer that question they will stand or fall.

The claim is often made in modern times that society is outgrowing the church. Many of the things which were once its specific function have passed into secular hands. Education was once one of these functions. There was a time when the only teachers were the priests. That time has passed. Philanthropy was once the specific function of the church. But it was seen that sectarian philanthropy defeats its own ends; and philanthropy was secularized. Meanwhile men of varying religious beliefs, many of whom have no church connections, are uniting for the establishment of hospitals and social settlements and municipal leagues. And every now and then a voice is raised proclaiming that one of these will take the place of the church, and that the church must be relegated, along with other institutions that have outlived their usefulness, to the limbo of forgotten vanities.

Churches which propose to continue their competitive and sectarian methods will find increasing force in this arrangement. A church whose chief business is to prescribe forms and do the religious thinking for the multitude, will be obliged to relinquish that function to some other institution which can perform it better. If it is to be simply an organization of those who think alike in matters of religion it would better hand over this work to some theological cult. If it is to be simply a company of those who move in the same social circle, it may delegate that task with confidence to a social club. And organizations which reach beyond denominational lines are able to enter more successfully into the specific work of reform.

It is, however, the very multiplicity of interests, by which the human mind is beset, that makes the question pertinent whether, among all the institutions that make for division and diversity, there may not be one that makes for unity and harmony. With this thought in mind we turn again to that memorable scene on the shores of Galilee, and ask the secret of the union which was there effected and has outlived the lapse of ages. We inquire about the nature of the bond which united a carpenter and two fishermen in an alliance so fast that death and all the wiles of the Evil One could not prevail against it. When we observe the difference of occupation between Jesus and his disciples we see that no trade-union could have held them together. We note their differences of temperament and are doubtful whether they could have worked together in harmony as members of a charities board. From what we are able to learn about them it is safe to say that they would have been unable all of them to affix their names to the creedal statements of any one of the great historic churches. But we find them somehow or other to have been fused and welded and wrought together by the power of a holy ideal into an institution that has survived the crash of empires and endured the vicissitudes of the centuries.

The secret of the union between Jesus and his disciples is that religion is essentially a social impulse, that there is no earthly tie which is more enduring, that men of the most diverse types of thought and habits of mind are able to unite under the banner of the religious ideal and go forth to conquer the world, just as the twelve men who united in the name of Jesus were able to effect an organization which in three short centuries was to control the destinies of the Roman Empire.

This in a single sentence is the burden of my theme, *religion a social force*, the

object of the church not to separate men into opposing camps by virtue of the things in which they differ, but to weld them together into an unconquerable army by means of the deep and changeless convictions and aspirations in which they agree. Because the church has failed to recognize this fundamental fact we are confronted by the great crime of sectarian exclusiveness, and behold Christendom split into sects which would exclude the Founder of Christianity himself. We live in an era of powerful industrial combinations, and have observed the immense increase of power which comes to two rival and competing firms when they have decided that henceforth, instead of competing, they will begin to co-operate. But in every city and nearly every village of America we are confronted by the spectacle of competing churches, each aiming to promote the Kingdom of God, but each insisting on promoting it on the basis of its own little creed or form, to the end that there is division where there ought to be union, discord where there ought to be harmony, weakness where there ought to be strength. Thus are the children of this world wiser in their day and generation than the children of light.

I plead as a Unitarian who, but for this hospitable faith, would to-day be a stranger and an alien in the religious world, for loyalty on the part of my fellow Unitarians to the church which is seeking to restore the liberty of thought which the Apostles held so dear, but which Christendom to-day denies. But I plead, also, no less earnestly, as a disciple of Channing, for that largeness of heart and hospitality of mind which would lead us to work, so far as we are able, in heartiest sympathy with those who still deny to Unitarians, Universalists, and Hicksite Friends a place in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. He is false to the very essence of religion who voluntarily relinquishes the companionship of his brethren in advancing God's kingdom upon earth, who would not hail

the day when men who might work effectively together in the vineyard of the Lord will no longer be kept apart by outworn forms and creeds. "In the present age of the world," said Channing, in an address given in Philadelphia three-quarters of a century ago, "it is perhaps best for those who agree in theological opinions to worship together; nor do I condemn the union of ourselves to these or any other churches whose doctrines we approve, provided that we do it without severing ourselves in the least from the universal church. We must shun the spirit of sectarianism as from hell. We must shudder at the thought of shutting up God in any one denomination. To confine God's love or his good spirit to any party, sect, or name, is to sin against the fundamental law of the kingdom of God, to break that living bond with Christ's universal church which is one of our chief helps to perfection. The sum and substance of Christ's teachings is plainly this, that inward holiness, or goodness, or disinterested love, is all in all."

Such language it was quite impossible for the Calvinistic theologians of Channing's time to understand. It seemed to them a deliberate turning aside from the duty of preaching such doctrines, as hell and sin and salvation, in order to discourse eloquently, but with futility upon the divine goodness, and to incite men to mere morality, philanthropy, and reform. By such men as Whitefield and Edwards and Morse, preachers like Channing were denounced as hypocrites and time-servers, seeking to retain their places as ministers of aristocratic churches at the expense of treason to the cause of Christ. But at a time when we are about to celebrate the centennial of Channing's Baltimore sermon how splendidly do these trenchant words comport with the demand for a wider catholicity which has been literally forced upon the churches as one of the unforeseen results of the great war!

This idea of the church as essentially catholic and as necessarily social, never

received finer embodiment than was given it by the Quaker poet, Whittier, in his poem, "The Meeting." He there represents himself as conversing with a friend who prefers to worship, not in the meeting-house, but in the out-of-doors:—

"Not in this close and rude-benched hall
But where soft lights and shadows fall,
And all the slow, sleep-waking hours
Glide soulless over grass and flowers."

The poet replies that he, too, is not insensitive to the spell of outer nature, the "temple never built with hands," but feels notwithstanding the need of something else that he finds in the quiet service of the Friends, with his neighbors seated about him, and then continues,—

"And so I find it well to come
For deeper rest to this still room.
For here the habit of the soul
Feels less the outer world's control.
The strength of mutual purpose pleads
More earnestly our common needs.
Where in thy name meet two or three
Our Lord hath said I there will be."

It was just as natural for the disciples of Jesus to unite to form the church as it was for the disciples of Socrates to unite to form the school.

Interdenominational Fellowship

I have been asked to speak to-day rather on the nature and possibilities of interdenominational fellowship rather than on the means by which this fellowship may be brought about. It is inevitable that the passionate desire of humanity, now everywhere in evidence for a completer unity than the world has ever known, should produce well-meant attempts at church unity which are destined to failure.

Interdenominational fellowship is not likely to be promoted by disloyalty to existing relationships or by the repudiation of debts to the past. It was the mistake of the organization which came into being as the American Congress of Liberal Religious Societies, and was known in its

latter days as the Congress of Religion that it sought to promote interdenominational comity through denominational disruption. The attempt to unite churches in a larger fellowship by inducing them to withdraw from the fellowships to which they belong, has never been completely successful, and when it is partially successful it creates one denomination more instead of making several denominations less.

Nor is interdenominational fellowship likely to be promoted by the method of compromise or the surrender of convictions actually cherished. A well-meant effort thus to promote it has been given to the world within the last few weeks by a self-appointed committee of prominent Episcopal and Congregational clergymen. It is known as "Proposals looking toward church unity." The most striking feature of the plan is the proposed agreement on the part of Congregational ministers to accept ordination at the hands of the Episcopal bishop of the diocese in which they live. Those accepting such ordination, provided that they have been baptized in the name of the Trinity, that they hold to the faith as contained in the Apostles and Nicene creeds, that they agree to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a prescribed way, and to recognize the authority of the bishop in case they are accused of errors of faith or conduct, are to be permitted to conduct services in Episcopal churches.

I cannot believe that any vital interdenominational fellowship is likely to come by such a surrender as this. It is the basic principle of congregationalism that it is the congregation itself, and not an ecclesiastical superior, that is competent not only to detect errors of faith, but also to ordain to the ministry of Christ. It would surely be an amazing way of observing the approaching tercentenary of the landing of the Pilgrims abjectly to abandon one of the most vital elements in the Pilgrim inheritance. It

is devoutly to be hoped that the great Congregational Church will reject any proposal looking toward church unity which contemplates its voluntary extinction as one of the parties to the contract.

Any enduring interdenominational fellowship must stand upon the basis, not of the surrender of one of the parties concerned, but of mutual appreciation and respect. No one denomination is likely to become the whole of Christianity. Each, probably, has its special task to perform and the world probably needs them all. But it needs them co-operating rather than competing, each respecting a point of view on the part of others that it does not share, because it realizes that the infinite complexity of human nature demands a variety of churches to meet a variety of needs.

Co-operation Not Competition.

At the close of the war for American Independence a group of American commonwealths, which had been welded together in the struggle, only to fall apart and to be rent by recriminations and rivalries when the war was over, formed an enduring union as the United States of America. Has not the time arrived when great organizations, formed for the worship of God and the service of man, may achieve at least as much of fraternity as was achieved one hundred and thirty years ago by the fathers of the Republic? Indications have multiplied of late, not only that sectarian rivalry was to be relegated to the rear, but, also, that an effective union of the religious forces of the world in behalf of righteousness, democracy, and brotherly love, was coming into being. The hopes of the centuries for a rejuvenated world, which some of us still have faith to believe, will take form in an effective League of Nations at this present time, will not come to full fruition until churches as well as commonwealths discover that waste is as wicked in organized religion as it is in organized industry.

Our young men at the front have been worshipping for the most part under conditions which to them were new and strange. In the home-land some of them had been accustomed to the stately service of the synagogue, or to the splendid accoutrements and solemn music of the cathedral, or to the simplicity of the Puritan meeting-house, or to the reverent silence of the Society of Friends. In France the same unpretentious hut was good enough for Catholic, Protestant, and Jew in turn; and at an hour when Catholic and Protestant, standing side by side, were about to offer themselves upon the alter of a common cause, if the offering should be demanded, it did not occur to them to decline to worship in a common house of God.

May we not have faith to believe that though God will continue to use for the good of mankind every branch of the universal church whose eye is single to his service, each branch of that church will think of itself in increasing measure, not as a fragment that is separated from the other fragments, but as an integral part of an organic whole, sharing responsibility for a common work! Our tastes will continue to differ and in our methods of worship we may stand apart, but whenever the call comes for a common effort, for a common cause, the different branches of the church of God will find themselves not separated but united, one body with many members, baptized into one body through consecration to a common task, whether we be Protestant or Catholic, Jew or Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free.

THE NATURE AND POSSIBILITIES OF INTERDENOMINATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

ADDRESS OF REV. FREDERICK A. BISBEE, D.D., EDITOR OF THE "UNIVERSALIST LEADER"

I am tempted to follow the impulse of my religious ancestors and become, like my forbears, a good Methodist and occupy my ten minutes or so in saying simply "Amen" over and over again to the address which has just been delivered. [Referring to the address by President Southworth of Meadville.] And yet, fearing that there might be some slight misunderstanding, I desire at this time not to make an address, but to make a few remarks of a very practical nature upon this great theme.

I am an apostle of the unity of Christian forces. In regard to the union of churches I think I am a good deal of a heretic. I am not in sympathy with the idea of a good many, both in my own church and in other churches, who are disposed to "scrap" the denomination, as they put it. I have the idea that the denomination is rather a good thing provided it is not abused, provided we use it temperately and not intemperately. You all remember how, when the great anxiety came upon the Allies abroad, when they feared that they were to be overcome by the powerful enemy, that they found that there was only one possible way in which the cause could be saved, and that was by the unification of the forces under a single command. And when Marshal Foch took charge of all the armies, we remember very well that he did not immediately run them all into one mould; he did not make them all infantry, all artillery, or all engineers, or all aviators; he preserved and strengthened the integrity of every department, and then correlated all those forces and made an army that marched to victory.

I don't know that we ought to base too much weight upon a war figure, but I

think there is a suggestion there for us to consider. For we are facing as churches the greatest conflict that the world has ever known, and we want united forces; but in order to unite those forces efficiently we are not to destroy the different parts. We are to preserve and strengthen the integrity of each distinct part of the world's forces of religion, and we have not been as careful of that consideration as we should have been. There are those, as I say, who are eager to scrap the denomination. They want to do away with it. They say it is an unmitigated evil. And the latest instance in that line is our good friend, whom we all love, John Haynes Holmes. Mr. Holmes withdraws from all denominational control, from all denominational affiliations, and starts forth in the world with the high and holy purpose, which he immediately tries to put into execution, of making a new denomination to be made up of his own and other churches of like opinion. And he says this is new. It is not new. It has been going on for years. Some of you will remember the organization of the Congress of Religions in Chicago right after the World's Fair, when very able men, men conspicuous in the history of modern religion—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, David Swing, H. W. Thomas, Rabbi Hirsch,—came together for the purpose of organizing a Congress of Religion which should be entirely independent of the old denominational restraints. I was present as a delegate from the Unitarians and Universalists in Philadelphia at their first meeting. And those great men did not see, that when they were organizing that new movement, they were organizing a new denomination. They went ahead and said, "We will have a theological school to educate our ministers; we will have a missionary propaganda." They actually engaged two men to go out as their missionaries. They had a newspaper as their official organ. They had everything that went to make up a denomination, and they organized in all seriousness a non-

sectarian sect, and they didn't know it. And that is just what our friend is doing; he is going to have another denomination.

Now, we are to consider this in a way from the point of efficiency, but I should like to call your attention to an ethical phase of the question. It is very hard for the people of to-day to get away from the idea that the church is a business institution. We like to think of it as such. We like to have the business of the church conducted in a business-like way, which is perfectly proper. But we should understand that there is an elemental difference between the processes and purposes of business and those of the church. Every business is organized and made efficient for the purpose of getting something. Every church that is a real church is organized and made efficient for the purpose of giving something. That is elemental; it is a fact. We cannot run churches on the fixed standards of business, because we have an entirely different objective. And you will notice that in almost every instance where there is this tremendous appeal for the union of churches, the appeal comes from those who say, "It will be a good deal cheaper to run one church than it is to run two or three." And usually those who make that plea are those who do not contribute anything anyway.

But that appeal to-day is not just, is not a just basis for action or for opinion upon this subject. For the church has this distinctive programme, this distinctive objective, to give—to serve, differing from anything else in the world, and it is to be judged by its own standards and not by the standard of business.

Furthermore, we should understand that it is not a mechanical process, it is not even a legislative process, that is to bring about union. It is education, or it is nothing. The best mechanic in the world cannot make a tree that will bear fruit. The wisest legislators cannot make a plant that will bloom with a beautiful flower. We must remember that we are

dealing not with things that can be built over and torn to pieces and put together; we are dealing with a living thing, and it will come to its fulness only through intensive, natural growth. We cannot by any possibility bring this about by a vote, nor by any mechanical efforts. We may help it along a little. But remember it is a living thing we are dealing with.

Federation, Not Unification

I like to feel that this Federation of Religious Liberals comes pretty near the ideal in the way of union of churches, the bringing together of these different religious organizations into annual or semi-annual assemblies—what for? Not for the purpose of making the Unitarians over into Friends, and the Friends into Universalists, nor all of us into Jews. Nothing of the kind. It is not even the purpose of a gathering like this to institute any great ecclesiastical movement. We have come here for the highest purpose in the world—for education, for inspiration, for fellowship; forces that will do more toward the salvation of the world than any others in existence; that is our objective.

We come together not to weaken, but to strengthen each other, to cheer each other, to help each other toward the fulfilling of our common purpose. I like to read over the programme which Dr. Wendte makes really a literary creation in connection with the announcements of this Congress. It seems to me that there is a great thought in this declaration, for instance:—

> "A huge, universal, ecclesiastical organization, existing in all lands, an *imperium in imperio*, is about the last thing any patriotic man in any enlightened country would wish to see. Let there be unity in action against the forces of evil, with the utmost freedom for individual opinion in matters of theology and organization. If one set of Christian men desires to worship God with an ornate ritual, and

still another in silence, why should they not be allowed to do so? If one group prefers an ecclesiastical organization headed by a Pope; a second, one headed by bishops; a third, one headed by ministers; and a fourth wants one without any ordained clergy, why thwart them? In our Father's house are many mansions.

"If all the faithful hold their—not the, but their—faith in the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life, then will the Christian Church as a whole go forth conquering and to conquer. Jesus Christ taught a religion of conduct, not of opinion. Christian men should follow him. When our boys come back from the front after facing realities, they will have little stomach for disputes. The motto of our Christian men should be "Diversity in opinion, unity in action."

—*John Brooks Leavitt, D.D.*

There is a message, and I like to feel that it is a great message which is coming to the world through us and others, one that is full of promise, full of prophecy. Do you know what our soldier boys went abroad for? They did not go for $30 a month and their clothes and poor food. Consciously or unconsciously they went for a high and holy purpose. It is the first time in all history, I think, when it stands out as distinctly as it does to-day that all our activities abroad were in the interest ultimately of—you may call it democracy for the world, but ultimately for the great fundamental principle of the Christian religion, and of all real religions, the universal brotherhood of man.

We are here in the interest of the same principle to-day—the universal brotherhood of man, which is no longer a dogma but a working programme of life—of all the relations of life, personal, social, political, economic, national, international —the universal brotherhood of man. That is the centre around which we unite, and this is my message to you to-day.

REASONS FOR SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED WORLD LEAGUE OF NATIONS

REV. DR. FREDERICK LYNCH, EDITOR OF "CHRISTIAN WORK," NEW YORK CITY, AND SECRETARY OF THE CHURCH PEACE UNION

I am to speak, first, of the League of Nations, and then of what religious people can do after it has come into existence to make it a more and more perfect organization. Let me speak of it from the point of view of some experiences that I had in Paris, from which I have recently returned.

I do not suppose a day goes by that some one does not ask me, "Are you in favor of the League of Nations?"—meaning, of course, the adoption of the present covenant which has been adopted at Paris and sent to our own country for adoption here. And I always answer: "Yes, I am; because it is either a League of Free Nations or, to quote H. G. Wells, 'a lot of freebooting nations.'" There is nothing else. The *New Republic*, the *Nation* and the *Dial*, while attacking the League of Nations, are offering absolutely nothing else. So far as I can see, we are to go back to a state that existed before the war—only we cannot go back to such a state as existed before the war, or ten thousand times worse. It is a League of Nations or it is anarchy. There is nothing else. If you do not get a League of Nations now, if we go back to the state where nations can do as they please, as they did before this war, they will do it with infinitely more encouragement than they ever did before. You will say, "No, we have pulled the claws out of Germany." True, we have, but we have not pulled the claws out of some other nations, and if it is going to be possible for every nation to do as it pleases, each nation living for itself alone, there are other nations that are going to do as Germany did, and with success, perhaps. Here is

this great Eastern world; I would not want to be responsible for what will happen if one nation was left to do its own will on China. I would not be responsible for what Italy would do if it was said to her, "You can do just as you please in the world," which is what will be said to her if we do not have some kind of community of nations. There is France. and there is my dear father-and-mother-land, England. Well, England has been in existence a good many years, and you know Mark Twain said of England: "The meek shall inherit the earth," and the meek might go on and inherit it if there is no restraint on England. The British people, as a whole, are a spendid and a democratic people, but if it was left free for England to do as it pleased when the war is over, no restraint whatever, I would not be responsible for what some men in England would try to do. You have either got to have some form of League of Nations or else you are going to have a lot of freebooting nations doing just what they wish in the world after peace is signed.

Short Comings of The League Covenant.

I want to say a few words about the present covenant that is before the world, and first I want to tell you a few points wherein I am greatly dissatisfied. You may be interested in knowing that I had a little part in writing it. I was on the Committee which was invited to Paris by the French Government to advise with the Official Committee of the Peace Conference, and I sat with that committee for two weeks in Paris while the covenant was being framed. We should all know that the covenant as it exists to-day is not Mr. Wilson's, it is not General Smuts's, it is not anybody else's; it is the composite of the work of American and Englishmen during the past four years, and it is a general expression of the mind of all the men who have been looking forward to a League of Nations. On the other hand,

it is a disappointment to a great many of us who went to Paris hoping that we were going to get a League of Nations which would almost usher in the millennium of national relationships. In the first place, it is not democratic enough. The council of a League of Nations should be made up of men elected, if not by the people—I would prefer to have every delegate to that council elected directly by the people of every nation, but if we cannot get that he at least should be elected by the Parliament of his nation; it should not be an appointed body. But this last was as much as we could get. When the committee got together in Paris, the first thing that was suggested was that the council should be made up simply of the ambassadors who were resident in any one capital in Europe —that they should be the League of Nations. That would have been a horrible thing. But finally it reached the point that the council should be made up of men appointed by the several countries. Now that is not democratic enough, but it was the best that we could get.

I think the present covenant is very, very deficient also in the matter of disarmament. I went to Paris, and many of the English group went there, hoping that we could get an article that would make disarmament a simultaneous, progressive thing in all the nations of the world, so that the step would be taken for which many of us had been longing through the years and which many of us feel is essential, that all nations should begin to reduce their armaments to the very lowest point possible. For two weeks this was debated, and finally it was seen that we could not get any such resolution through that particular Peace Conference in Paris. But we got one step taken. The covenant provides that there shall be no secret manufacture of armaments anywhere in the world, and that all the plans for armaments that any nation has shall be laid bare to all the nations in the world. You say that is not much. But see what a change it has made right here in

Washington. Three days ago Secretary Daniels, who had recommended that we build ten more battleships, costing millions and millions of dollars, and ten more naval cruisers, went before the Naval Committee and said: "I withdraw that recommendation, because we will not need them if we have the League of Nations."

Another thing that I regret very much about the present covenant of the League is that the neutral nations were not invited both into its formation and into its membership at the beginning. I wish that all the neutral nations had been invited to Paris at the Peace Conference and had been told, "Come in now and join the League with us on equal terms." Of course the reason it was not done was that the peace problem was so intricately mixed up with the League of Nations; the two were so one that the neutrals were not invited, having no particular part in the terms of peace. But it would have been better if all that had been brushed aside and all nations had been invited to Paris and asked to come into the League on an equality. Personally—although I do not think there is any other single man in the twenty-five or thirty men at Paris who concurred with me,—personally I would have been in favor of inviting Germany to come in the moment peace was signed; not because I think Germany would have contributed any particular value to the League in her present condition, but because I think that the other nations of the world could have helped Germany to get again upon her feet. I mean the new Germany, the new German people. I could go on and enumerate other weaknesses in the League, but I want now to look at the other side.

Gains of the League Covenant

Take this present covenant and examine it and let me enumerate the great gains. Take the covenant as it stands, with all its imperfections, these I have mentioned

and many others. One I did not mention, that it probably puts in the hands of the Allied group great power which could be misused. It looks sometimes almost as if it was a grouping of victorious nations who intended to keep their power and govern the rest of the world, instead of the rest of the world governing itself. I will grant that objection, although I think it is not as great an objection as some consider it. But you have got here at last—and this is to my mind the greatest step that has been taken in civilization for ages—you have got a group of nations who have at last learned the community life, and are willing—a group of fifteen or twenty—to come together and say "We are going to live as a community in the world," rather than a lot of isolated, selfish nations living each for itself alone. We are going to live, all for each and each for all." Now whatever imperfections there may be in the covenant of the League, whatever dangers may be inherent in the League, whatever things it may not be able to accomplish, whatever perils it may precipitate us into, nevertheless you have got at least the nations of the world thinking in a community spirit; and I say that is one of the greatest steps in the whole history of civilization.

We had the beginnings of it in the Hague Conference. There we only talked. Now we have got the actuality of it—a certain group of nations that pledge themselves to live together in a community, cooperative spirit rather than in a spirit of strife and isolation, of selfishness and competition.

The second great thing we have got in this League covenant is this: Although there be only five great nations, five great powers, we will say, in that League—there are ten, fifteen, twenty, but we will say only five—we have got five great nations that have pledged themselves absolutely hereafter to settle all disputes of any kind that may arise between them without going to war and by peaceable or

judicial or conciliatory methods. That is, you have taken out of the world one great area of war possibility. If the United States goes into the League of Nations and accepts it as England and France have done, you immediately have got England and France and the United States pledged to settle any disputes that may arise between them by peaceable and judicial methods. Outside of England and France and Japan, there is no danger. I mean those are the only three powers commensurate with her size that the United States could go to war with. But here you have got a group of nations pledged absolutely, not by agreement simply or treaty, as in the Hague Conference, but pledged in a federation—a federation almost as real as that between Pennsylvania and New York. That is, you are in a sort of super-nation the moment you go into this League, and you are bound not only by written treaties, but you are bound as a member of a great international state. This is a second great gain, no matter what weaknesses you may find in the covenant of the League of Nations.

The third great gain is this: However imperfect this covenant of the League of Nations may be, those nations which are in it are pledged to maintain the peace with the rest of the world. Now I am not an advocate of force, and yet I do not distrust it altogether. If I were in Philadelphia this morning and a maddened, intoxicated man should be coming down the streets of the city and begin shooting promiscuously women and children, right and left, I would not hesitate for a moment to use a police force to restrain that man. I do not see, if I believe in that, why I should hesitate one minute more if a maddened, intoxicated nation should break loose in a world where most of the world was ordered and organized and believed in peace—why the force of that ordered, organized world should not be used to restrain the maddened and intoxicated nation which starts out to de-

stroy, we will say, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden or any of the other small nations of the world. Now all that the League of Nations provides is that the organized forces of the world shall be used with the maddened, intoxicated nations in just the same way that the organized force of your cities is used to restrain the maddened and intoxicated man. There is no difference whatever; in theory it is just the same.

I think personally that that is a great step forward in civilization, that there are enough nations that have agreed to live in an orderly, peaceful way, who will say, "We agree to settle our own disputes by judicial methods; we agree to observe the laws of humanity, any laws that may be passed; we are going to police the rest of the world, we are going to use our united, organized forces against any nation that sets out to break the peace of the world."

In the fourth place, whatever criticisms you may make of the League of Nations as it exists at the present time, you have in that League what I consider one of the highest Christian principles to which mankind has attained—that the strong is the custodian of the weak, that the man who has rights and has power shall guarantee the rights not of himself but of the man who has no strength or power or rights. So I believe that in this League of Nations, while the great, strong nations of the world have pledged themselves to guarantee the rights of the weak nations of the world to live their own lives and have every opportunity and every privilege, just as much as the strong nation has, you have made a great step forward in civilization. I will not say that that is perfect; I will not say that that is not going to be open to some violation. You cannot have any perfect thing in this world, much easier than you can have a perfect man. I think that the League already has violated that principle slightly in one or two instances, but nevertheless, fundamentally, as the League grows more and more, that is going to be one of its

functions, to guarantee to the weak nations of the world absolutely the right that the strong nations everywhere have.

And finally on this point, whatever we may feel about the present covenant of the League of Nations, we should remember that it is going to do this: The great nations of the world are going to sit together in council year by year, considering together, which is something they have never done before, considering together the welfare of all nations and of all humanity.

Now as to the industrial situation. At no other peace conference in history has a group of countries gotten together after a war to do anything except for each country to get just what it could. Now it is a great thing that a group of countries, gotten together after a war, should rise to that attitude where they could adopt nine points on the industrial situation of the world in the covenant of their League. Those nine points are not miraculous, they are not wonderful, but they are a sign of what we may do with the League if once we can get it.

In a condensed way I have tried to portray the weaknesses of the League, but also to tell truthfully what the League has accomplished. As I said in the beginning, it is simply a choice of taking this League that can and will do these things, or at least has been fashioned for doing these things, or it is going back to a state of individualism where every nation shall do as it pleases in the world. And I know what that means. It means not only that some nations will immediately go to war again, but it will mean revolutions of all sorts. The world is in a state where all its nerves are bare, and if the Peace Conference should adjourn without doing anything to offset the awful price we have paid in this war the whole world would be hysterical. I would not be responsible for what would happen, so great would be the disappointment of all countries. I have just been reading in the papers, coming out on the train, Mr. Wilson's

Memorial Day Address. How splendidly he states what will happen if the League does not go through! I know what will happen. I have been in France and England two months. There will be such a wail of despair all over Europe it will simply go into anarchy. You cannot prevent it.

Our Duty toward the League of Nations

Now what are religious people going to do, granted that we are going to have a League of Nations? We have got to have it. No power will stop it. It will be ratified in Washington; I haven't the slightest doubt it will be ratified.

Grant, then, that the United States goes into this League, what are religious people to do? The first thing to remember is this: No piece of machinery in this world can ever accomplish any spiritual thing unless there is infused into it out of human personality and out of divine sources that spirit which makes the machinery to live. So that no matter what kind of covenant you get to start with—as Mr. Taft said the other day, "Any kind of League is good enough to start with,"—but no matter what kind of covenant we get to start with, it will not work unless the religious people of the world constantly keep it before their soul and mind, and constantly are interpreting it on spiritual and ethical and moral lines, are constantly lifting it up out of the realm of politics and machinery and making it a living, vital thing. It ought to be just as much the concern of every young man and woman during the next fifty years to see that this League becomes a thing of the spirit and soul, a living, throbbing thing, just as much as it was for the young men who after the great war in our own country went into the work of reconstruction, determined that somehow or other the United States should not be simply a piece of machinery, but should be a living, vital organism in which the

very highest aspirations and ideals of the nation should find expression.

The second thing is that it is for the religious people of the world to see that whatever League of Nations we have, it does not become a great, powerful, selfish organization of nations to be used for their own ends. I will admit frankly that the chief danger I see, the danger which to my mind outweighs all others in the League of Nations, is that it should be a great balance of power of the victorious Allies over against the other nations of the world. It can be made an instrument of tyranny and of oppression. It is for us religious people, free people, to see that it never does become such an instrument of oppression. It is for us from the President down, and here he is with us—read his words this morning—it is for us, I think, especially here in America, to see that this League of Nations which we are certainly going to have, and which is going to be made up chiefly of the victorious Allied nations at first, never becomes a group of nations for aggression, for tyranny, for self-aggrandizement, or for wreaking vengeance upon any other nation in the world. That is where religious people have got a great task before them.

The third thing is that religious people should insist that when the covenant is formed all the nations of this world are invited into it, so that it shall be a real brotherhood of nations, and that all nations shall be invited in on equal terms, and that there shall be no dominance within the League of any one or two great powers any more than within the United States there is any dominance of one or two great states. If the United States had been organized on the basis that certain states within the Union were privileged above other states, the Union would have gone to pieces long ago. If the League of Nations is to be an organization where two or three or four nations are favored above any other power, with power or dictatorship or governorship, then I say it will not be a success. It is for

religious people to insist that all the nations of the world be incorporated within the League at the soonest possible moment, and all incorporated as in any democratic organization, with equal powers and with representative vote.

I have briefly outlined these ideas; I leave them with you. I simply want to say in closing what I said at the beginning. The choice has got to be made between a League of Nations and a world of selfish, isolated nations. The world as I see it is such that no nation can live for itself alone any longer. I think it is going to be a world full of frictions and troubles continually, unless it is an organized world. I heard Senator Borah say the other day that the United States should not enter into any contract with European nations that would make us have to take part in the settlement of "a little Balkan squabble." Such provincialism saddens one more than anything else almost in the United States; that a Senator of the United States could say such a thing as that! There are men who have lived through this war of four years and a half and have not felt it any more than that little child of three on the steps yonder has felt it. If they had been making a speech on August 3, 1914, and it had been interrupted by the war, when the peace was signed they would have gone right on and finished the same speech. They have learned nothing. Some of our senators evidently are of that type. The war has not touched them. They might have been sleeping with Rip Van Winkle over in Sleepy Hollow. "The United States is not going to take part in any Balkan squabbles?" We have just taken part in a little Balkan squabble which cost us two million men sent over and many of them dead. A little Balkan squabble! Senator Borah does not realize that Serbia is just as near to Philadelphia as it is to Vienna, as near to Washington and New York as it is to Vienna. There is no more sea, there is no more space, there is no more isolation. No two nations in

the world can ever again have a duel without all the world being implicated as it is in this. We are a family, we are one. All the question is, what kind of family are we going to be? Each one seeking his own, living for himself, seeking his own ends, or are we going to be a family living each for all, where the welfare of the family is above the welfare of any individual in it, where no one in the family seeks for anything for himself that he does not seek for all the rest? That is the choice that lies before the conference at Paris now. There is no other choice but that. So when anybody asks me about the League of Nations I say, I do not like the present covenant from some points of view; it is not everything I wanted; but I cannot see anything else to take at present. I think it has in it four or five great steps forward for civilization, and I think that you and I can make it to be in the course of years just as perfect a piece of world organization as we have made the United States a perfect piece of national organization.

OUR INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS—A WORLD-LEAGUE OF PEACE

PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH.D., LL.D.,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

I was told early in the afternoon that my subject had in part been covered by a previous speaker. But, if I should find myself in agreement with him it would be a comfort, as it would also be an indication, perhaps, that both of us may be on the right road, having independently reached the same conclusion.

The question that I would like to place before you this afternoon is one that is being asked in England, in France, and in this country, and no doubt in other countries, and which cannot be suppressed or repressed. We have won the war for the overthrow of militarism. Militarism is dead. I do not believe that there is the slightest possibility of its resurrection. It was the last desperate struggle of militarism that we witnessed in the recent war. But have we won the war for democracy? Is the world being made safer for democracy now that the war against militarism has come to a successful issue? That is my question.

It is not necessary to go so far as a radical newspaper in New York recently did, which claimed that while Germany was defeated in the field, she nevertheless has won the war, because she has gained a democracy, while the Allies since the end of the war appear to be swayed by an imperialistic spirit which is akin to militarism and autocracy.

Now I say it is not necessary to go so far as that. That view is untenable, because it is extreme; but it is significant that the statement was made in all seriousness, and I believe as a matter of fact that democracy is strong, if not strongest, at the present time in Germany, because it has come as the result of the overthrow of militarism in that country.

We perhaps do not realize the great boon of democracy as much as Germany must at the present time just because she has gained it at such a frightful sacrifice; a sacrifice, alas, which the world also had to share in.

Another symptom of a certain feeling of disappointment that is undoubtedly spreading over the world, is to be found in the notable utterance a few weeks ago by one of the leading divines of England, the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore. I would strongly commend those of you who have not read the remarkable sermon that he preached in St. Michael's Church, in Oxford, on March 26, to do so.* It is a sermon which ought to be read especially by those who would not be disposed to agree with Bishop Gore.

It is not so much what he says, but the fact that he says it,—that he, in a peculiarly favorable position for sensing the prevailing spirit, felt that there was great danger lest we, the Allies—and he includes us in that group—lose the fruits of the victory that we gained in the recent war; a danger lest we find ourselves on the wrong road, and, according to the predominance of the conservatist or radical impetus, going slowly or rapidly on the wrong road.

That is what Bishop Gore emphasized in his remarkable address. He expressed a fear, although at the end of his sermon he struck a more hopeful note and felt that the situation was not perhaps as desperate as it might appear. Now what is that reason for that fear? I am sure that every one who has followed the course of events during the last few weeks is not insensible to a wave of disappointment passing over the country, and, what is especially significant, this same feeling is passing over the European countries which are so much nearer to the centre, to what we may call the pulse of the world.

What has happened to lead us to feel

*Published in the New York *Nation* of May 16, 1919.

that things are going to be very much as they were before the war; that the new peace treaty is based upon the old principle of dividing the spoils among the victors; that we are about to witness a redistribution of the map of Europe, after which the Peace Conference will adjourn? You know that one reason why we have so many wars to the discredit of the nineteenth and other centuries is because we have had so many peace conferences. Every peace conference in the past has planted the seed for the next war. Immanuel Kant said that at the end of the eighteenth century in his essay on "A Perpetual Peace." He was not a visionary; he was a very circumspect thinker and also gifted with vision. His essay was an attempt to get rid of the danger inherent in every peace treaty.

Now, are we going to have another result like that which followed upon 1815, upon 1856, and upon 1878? The story is told of the Congress of Berlin in 1878, where the leading figure was Bismarck, that he spoke of himself as the broker of the assembled nations, handing out certificates of stock to the various beneficiaries, and priding himself on the fact that as the broker he didn't even get a commission for himself. The metaphor is very characteristic; Peace conferences have been political stock exchanges in which one nation's gain was another nation's loss.

There is a fear expressed that despite the many utterances we heard during the war about the new order that was to set in, yet somehow or other the spirit of the old order is as strong in Paris as in previous conferences,—leading to a redistribution of the map of Europe, to patching up of difficulties, to remedying wrongs that were done thirty or forty years ago, but at the same time creating new occasions for discord which will in the course of time lead to further disturbances. It has been suggested that when speaking of past peace conferences we

ought to spell the term "peace" in a different way, namely—p-i-e-c-e.

What has happened to create that feeling? It is difficult to analyze the situation in exact terms. On the surface, very little, really, has happened to create discouragement. We have had brought before us as an instrument for peace, a constitution of a League of Nations, which, if consistently carried out, ought to diminish the possibilities of war by at least sixty-five per cent. We have also had brought before us a Peace Treaty which, from the point of view of inflicting a punishment adequate to the crime, is quite fair. I hope I may not be misunderstood if I add that from the purely ethical point of view which tells us that a wrong *must* be punished, and that, according to Old Testament ethics, the innocent generation necessarily suffers for the crimes of the previous one, the peace treaty brought before us, is not unjust, because Germany *did* commit a crime against civilization. And I say that as one of those who admired Germany before the war and had reason to appreciate the great achievements of German scholars in the field of Science, and of the German Government in the field of municipal government, and in its legislation for the laboring classes. And yet, despite the fact that the authors of some of our greatest ethical systems, like those of Kant, Hegel, Schleiermacher, and Fichte were Germans, yet Germany, when the war broke out, threw aside all standards of ethics, flouted all humanitarian sense and by the brutal manner in which she conducted this last war forfeited the respect of the world. A nation cannot do that, especially a nation that knew better,—a nation that had her leaders and her thinkers to tell her what the proper standard of ethics was, without having punishment inflicted on her. From that point of view nothing serious has happened in connection with the Treaty, and yet, as you know, those who cannot possibly be suspected of hav-

ing any kindly feeling toward the Germans, those in fact who are hostile to them, yet are denouncing this treaty as imposing obligations upon Germany which she cannot carry out; that the treaty itself defeats its own aims; that you cannot expect a nation to pay an enormous indemnity if you take away from her the means of industry by which she can raise the amount; that you cannot expect a man to work if you cut off his hands; and that is what it is claimed that this treaty is doing. I am not saying whether it is doing that or not. The mere fact that the question is raised indicates that the feeling spreading throughout the world, that the spirit of *vae victis* is dominating in some way the council of the nations assembled at Paris. It is difficult, I say, to analyze the situation in definite terms, and I am using the treaty merely as an illustration of my theme.

The subject assigned to me, "International Obligations," shows by way of contract what we are looking forward to in connection with this conference, namely, the spirit which emphasizes mutual aid and responsibility. We must not make the mistake of assuming that those who are sitting in the conference at the present time do not wish to do the right thing. I am sure that they do. But we have a feeling that they are being swayed as conferences have been in the past by national interests, and an undue emphasis on national interests always conflicts with ideal international standards. The emphasis on national interests leaves out of view the sense of international obligations, the feeling that when nations come together in a conference they must be guided by a larger vision, by an outlook upon the world in general. This should especially be the case at the end of a catastrophe such as we have passed through during the last five years.

We in this country have every reason to feel proud of the position that we took on this question of international obliga-

tion, both before we entered the war and after we had done so. The President of this country has made himself the spokesman of the new order to which we looked forward. In utterances that were remarkable for their mastery of the subject, and impressive by their beautiful and striking language, he sent his message to all the peoples of the world who were affected by this war. Just let me quote one or two of these utterances:—

"The world can be at peace only if its life is stable and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is no tranquillity of spirit, justice, freedom, and right."

At the very moment that we declared war President Wilson followed his famous dictum that "the world must be made safe for democracy" by declaring that the Peace to come "must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberties." On the eve of the assembling of the Peace Conference he again struck the high note in declaring: "We have used great words. All of us have used the great words Right and Justice; and now we are to prove whether or not we understand these words—and we must not only understand them, but we must have the courage to act upon our understanding."

There is a feeling that in some way or the other we, represented at the Peace Conference by the President, have not been able to carry out these ideas. The criticisms on the Peace Treaty, and some of the criticisms on the League of Nations into which I need not enter here, run in that direction. One hesitates to put oneself in the position of a critic of the League of Nations, because most of the criticisms have come from people in this country who represent precisely that spirit which we fear prevails in Paris. Most of the critics of the League do not want the League of Nations, they prefer the old style of peace conferences. For this reason one is loath to criticize the provisions of the League of Nations; and

still less our great President, for I look upon him as one of the most remarkable of modern statesmen, and as the hope of democracy and liberty in the international obligation. The bulk of the opponents of the President are the same who opposed the stand that President Wilson took during the war as much as they opposed the stand he took before we entered the war. And yet, even among those who are the supporters of the President, who have supreme confidence in his good intentions as in his great ability, this question is being asked: Has he—have we—succeeded in bringing about a condition of affairs which will justify us in proclaiming that the world is entering on a new era, that it is being made safer for democracy?

The League of Nations, even by those who want a league, it is claimed, is not a league of *peoples* at all. It is a league consisting of representatives of *governments*, in which the five strongest governments will have the controlling power. Although, for most of the acts of the League, unanimity is required, yet the moral strength, the great power, the physical power behind England, France, Italy, the United States, and Japan, is such as to dwarf the opposition of the others. It has been claimed that the Council is so arranged as to form a voting trust; that they can always retain the control in their hands, and so on. The criticisms that the members of the Council will be representatives of governments and not of peoples is indeed a serious one. That, to my mind, is a genuine defect, perhaps the only serious criticism that I would venture to pass—that the representatives will represent the governments that happen to be in power.

Now I mention this simply as an indication of this feeling of disappointment that is affecting those who looked forward hopefully a few months ago to the establishment of a new order in international relations—one based on the sense of inter-

national obligation. And yet it seems to me that we have no reason to feel dismayed if we look at the situation in the light in which the previous speaker has brought it before us. He took a number of thoughts out of my mouth, or rather out of my head, but I am glad to find myself in perfect agreement with him in the emphasis that he placed upon the spirit with which we should meet present conditions. And the point that I would like to bring out supplemental to his is this: What we are witnessing in Paris at the present time is actually another life and death struggle, the death throes of an order that is passing away and the birth pangs of a new order that is about to be created. The new order is not going to spring full blown out of the brow of Jupiter or of any other God; all that we can expect to see at the present time are the *beginnings* of the new order. A moment's reflection, I think, will make it clear that we have no right to expect more than what is actually happening at the present time, and for the reason that when we in this country use the word "democracy," we speak a different language from the European nations when they use the word. The present situation in Paris finds an analogy in the biblical legend of the Tower of Babel. You will remember that that structure was to be reared after a great catastrophe had come over this world, and that the people gathered together and tried to build a great tower as a haven of refuge. It was a good idea, but they did not speak the same language and they could not build the tower. That is what is happening at the present time in Europe. The nations after a frightful catastrophe are trying to construct a new order as a guarantee against another disorder, but the peoples do not understand one another.

We in this country have developed our ideas of democracy independently of the European traditions and the European complications and entanglements. Europe

has had an endless succession of entangling alliances for many centuries. When we look at the map of Europe we see how natural such a condition is; see how the nations elbow one another in European land. Look at the mass of nations represented in Europe, each concerned for its own interests; each struggling against the other. Consider more particularly the conglomeration of nations in Eastern Europe and in the Balkans—Poles, Bohemians, Serbians, Hungarians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Jugo-Slavs, Rumanians, and Turks—and add to this the fact that these peoples belong to three different religions,—the Greek Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and Mohammedanism. These religious differences constitute further factors all making for discord. Consider the history of these lands and the bloody struggles that the nations in question have gone through, and add to this the traditions that have been established for regulating international relationships on the basis of diplomatic combinations and intrigues. The result is exactly what one would have reason to expect. We must not grow impatient because of the slowness of the process in establishing new political methods based on the sense of international obligation. You cannot overthrow long-established traditions at a single blow. European diplomacy which has grown up out of these traditions established by the history of the past centuries rests primarily upon expediency and only in a secondary degree upon justice. We have as a natural outcome the methods adopted by peace conferences in the past,—to parcel out the territory by reason of victories gained on the field and by a new deal to secure a respite from conflict. The international conference in the past never established peace but merely a more or less prolonged armistice. Moltke is said to have remarked at the close of the war of 1870-1871, "We will have peace now for fifty years." And he came within a few years of prophesying the truth.

It is under these conditions of perpetual conflict and struggle among nations that democracy has grown up in Europe. Naturally it is a different product from our own American democracy which has been developed independently of established traditions. Our entrance, therefore, into the present Peace Conference represents the introduction of an entirely new factor for the first time in the history of the world. Justice as the first consideration and expediency as the second have been set up by us as guidance for the settling of international disputes. Our presence at the Peace Conference is in itself a protest against the old method and against the incrustated traditions of European diplomacy. We must look upon President Wilson at the Peace Conference as a symbol of the new factor, struggling to create a new order out of the chaos brought about by the old.

Has the President yielded, in a spirit of compromise, to the old? That appears to be the crucial question which many people are asking. In an effort to judge the situation fairly, we must leave out of consideration anything that smacks of the personal. There are so many contradictory opinions current about the President that it is next to impossible to form a fair picture of him in one's mind. He is obstinate according to some, while according to others he is perpetually compromising; he is idealistic and entirely too academic; and yet on the other hand he is denounced as an opportunist. In a situation like the present we ought not to consider the President as a personality, but the President as the bearer of certain ideals, as the symbol of the new principle that is being introduced into the council chambers of the representatives of the nations. Let us also realize the novelty of the experiment that is being tried and, perhaps, a story that came to me directly, may serve to illustrate the contrast between the American and the European spirit.

An acquaintance of mine who held a

high position in the service and who returned only a few weeks ago, met in Paris a Frenchman who also had a high position in the government, a man who had the opportunity of seeing what was going on behind the scenes. The Frenchman said to the American, "There is one thing we do not understand about you Americans; you have not yet announced what you want to get out of the war." "Get out of the war?" said the American; "we don't want to get anything out of the war." Whereupon the Frenchman smiled and suggested that "Every one wants something." Now does not that represent the great difficulty which the President had to encounter, "Every one wants something." A wit has suggested that the only things America has gotten out of the war are the Influenza and Prohibition. With every nation represented at the Peace Conference after something, except our own, the atmosphere in which the President lived for six months could not have been very congenial. It is not surprising that he and those who looked forward for a different spirit prevailing should feel somewhat discouraged, and that in the struggle for carrying out the American ideals of democracy it has been found necessary to make concessions for fear of a complete relapse into reactionary methods. Is it fair to speak of these concessions as compromises? I hold not, so long as one is not disloyal to one's convictions. If you will realize as the previous speaker, Prof. Paul M. Pierson, instanced in the case of Lincoln, that one cannot do more than take one step at a time; it is evident that it was foolish to hope for a complete acceptance of the Fourteen Points at the present time. These Fourteen Points should be regarded as outlining the programme for the future regulation of international relations; they may be called the "New International Declaration of Independence." Let us bear in mind that when our own Declaration of Independence was promulgated with its opening statement that every in-

dividual has a right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," slavery existed in this country, and seventy years passed before the contradiction was removed. The Constitution of the United States, adopted after a long debate, was justly regarded as one of the most remarkable documents ever produced by the mind of man; and yet it has been found necessary, not only to modify it, but to introduce amendments of a radical character.

We are witnessing at Paris the process of an adaptation to an entirely new condition. The old is never entirely thrown aside to make way for the new. History shows that the process involved in bringing about a new order is rather one of shading the old into the new. At all events, what has happened at Paris is exactly what we should have looked forward to. With America bringing forward an entirely new idea of international obligation, some concessions to the long prevailing methods of European diplomacy were inevitable. A certain amount of confusion due to the clash between national interests and international obligation was likewise inevitable. With France nervous and hysterical lest another attack be made upon her at some future time; with Italy desirous to use the opportunity of the war for strengthening herself; with England relieved at being rid of an economic rival, and with Japan distinctly ambitious, it is manifestly unreasonable to hold the President responsible for being unable to carry out *completely* the programme which he no doubt had in view. Enough has leaked out of the meetings of the Council to make it certain that the President was engaged in a constant struggle to maintain the sense of international obligation.

It seems to me that instead of concentrating our attention on what has *not* been accomplished, we should rather take courage and fresh hope from the actual results. I have, particularly, in mind the organization of a League of Nations through the Paris Conference, which I

am satisfied will be regarded by the historian of the future as marking a new point of departure in international relations. The League must be looked upon as a logical outcome of the purpose for which the war was waged; for unless some definite step is *now* taken, even though it be of an experimental nature, for preventing the outbreak of another international conflict, the fruits of victory will be lost. It is looking at events from the wrong end to criticise defects in the Constitution of the League. These defects, whatever they may be, will be remedied, and the Constitution of the League provides ample means for such amendment. The main point is that without a League of civilized nations international anarchy will set in. The choice lies between the progress of democracy and the possible reactionary movement which will be brought about if the great nations of the world fail to recognize their international obligations. The League is a symbol of the spirit of international obligation which underlies what I have called the "New International Declaration of Independence," brought forward by the President, who in his so-called Fourteen Points, gave a definite expression to the spirit of American democracy.

While realizing, therefore, that in negotiations for peace certain concessions to European traditions as well as to European conditions were necessary, or, if you choose, inevitable, we should respond to a sense of hope and encouragement at the thought that some forward steps have been taken. If we, who believe in democracy and in the progress of liberal thought, begin to falter and indulge in small criticisms instead of standing behind the President in his struggle, then, of course, the outlook will be dark indeed. I firmly hold that it is our duty and privilege as Americans, committed to the ideals of American democracy that have grown up in this country since its birth, to stand by the leader, who, as the spokesman of this republic, has unfurled for

the first time to the gaze of the world the banner of international obligation. If we march under that banner we can look forward, hopefully, that further steps along the line of progress will be taken in the future. If we stand by our colors, the world will come to realize that only under such a banner can there be any substantial progress, leading eventually to the disappearance of war, which cannot be regarded as anything else but a strange survival of barbarism into the age of civilization.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.